Smectymnuus REDIVIVUS.

Being an Answer to a Book, intituled

AN HUMBLE

REMONSTRANCE

In which

The Original of { LITURGY / EPISCOPACY } is discussed

And Queries propounded concerning both.

The PARITY of Bishops and Presbyters in Scripture demonstrated.

The occasion of the IMPARITY in Antiquity discovered.

The *Disparity* of the Ancient and our Modern Bishops manifested.

The ANTIQUITY of Ruling Elders in the Church vindicated.

The PRELATICAL Church Bounded.

Composed by five Learned and Orthodox Divines.

THE Fifth EDITION.

JER. 6. 16.

Thus saith the Lord, stand in the ways, and behold, and aske for the Old way, which is the way, and walk therein.

Ter. de Præs. adv. hæres.

Id Dominicum & verum, quod prius traditum: id autem extraneum & falsum quod sit posterius.

LONDON,
Printed for *John Rothwell*, at the *Fountain* in *Goldsmiths-Row* in *Cheapside*, 1661.

TO THE READER.

Good Reader,

SOlomon *told us long since, that* there is no end of many books, Eccleſiaſt. 12. 12. Scripturiency (*it ſeemeth*) *is no novel humour but abounded then, even when the means of tranſmitting knowledge was more difficult; if there were cauſe for the complaint then, there is much more now; ſince the* Preſſe *hath helped the* Penne, *every one will be ſcribling, and ſo better bookes are neglected, and lie like a few graine of Corn under an heap of Chaffe and duſt: uſually* books *are received as* faſhions; *the* neweſt, *not the* beſt *and moſt* profitable, *are moſt in eſteem; in ſo much that really learned and ſober men have been afraid to publiſh their labours, leſt they ſhould divert the world from reading the uſefull works of others that wrote before them.* * *I remember* Dr. Altingius *a terſe and neat ſpirit, ſtood out the battle of twenty yeares importunity, and would not yeild to divulge any thing upon this fear. Certainly* (Reader) *'tis for thy profit ſome times to look-back and conſult with them that firſt laboured in the mines of knowledge, and not alwaies to take up with what*

* Videbat enim paſſim laborari mole & copia variorum in hoc genere commentatorum, novis ediciombus anticipitem reddi eorum delectum; ſed meliores etiam, id eſt veteres illos & probatos Authores è ſtudioſorum manibus extuti &c. *Præfat. Script. torum Theolog. Hemic. Alting.*

cometh next to hand. In this controverſie of Diſcipline *many have written, but not all with a like judgement and ſtrength, which I believe hath been no ſmall* rock of offence, and ſtone of ſtumbling to the adverſaries, *who are hardned with nothing ſo much* as a weak defence of the truth, *as* * Auſtin complaineth, *that when he was a* Manichee *he had had too too often the victory put into his hands by the defences of weak and unskilfull* Chriſtians. *This work which the* Stationer *hath now revived (that it may not be forgotten, and like* a Jewel after once ſhewing, ſhut up in the Cabinet of private ſtudies only) *was penned by* * *ſeveral worthy* Divines *of great note and fame in the* Churches *of* Chriſt, *under the borowed and covert Name of* SMECTYMNUUS, *which was ſome matter of ſcorne and exception to the adverſaries, as the* Papiſts *objected to* Calvin his printing his Inſtitutions *under the name* of Alcuinus, *and to* Bucer *his naming himſelf* Aretius Felinus, *though all this with out ground and reaſon, the* affiction of the name to any worke, *being a thing indifferent: for there we muſt not conſider ſo much the* Author, as the matter, *and not who ſaid it, but* what; *and the aſſumption of another name not being infamous, but where it is done out* of deceit, *and to anothers prejudice, or out* of ſhame *becauſe of guilt*, *or* fear *to owne the truths which they ſhould*

* Quædam noxia victoria pæne mihi ſemper in diſputationibus proveniebat cum Chriſtianis imperitis: *Auguſt. contra Manich.* cap. 19.

* Mr. *Steven Marſhal.* Mr. *Edm. Calamy.* Dr. *Thomas Young.* Mr. *Matthew Newcomen.* Dr. *William Spurſtowe.*

ſhould eſtabliſh : I ſuppoſe the Reverend Authours were willing to lie hid under this ONOMASTICK, *partly that their work might not be received with prejudice, the faction againſt which they dealt, arrogating to themſelves a Monopoly of Learning, and condemning all others as ignorants and novices not worthy to be heard ; and partly that they might not burthen their Frontiſpiece with a* voluminous nomenclature, *it not being uſuall to affix ſo many names at length to one Treatiſe.*

For the work it ſelf, it ſpeaketh its own praiſe, and is now once more ſubjected to thy cenſure and judgement : This ſecond publication of it was occaſioned by another book for vindication of the Miniſtery *by the Provinciall Aſſembly of* London, *wherein there are frequent appeals to* Smectymnuus ; *though otherwiſe I ſhould have judged the reprinting ſeaſonable ; for the Lord hath now returned us to ſuch a juncture of time, wherein there is greater freedom of debate without noyſe and vulgar prejudice ; and certainly if the quarrell of Epiſcopacy were once cleared, and brought to an iſſue, we ſhould not be ſo much in the dark in other parts of Diſcipline, the conviction of an* Errour *by* ſolid grounds *being the beſt way to finde out the* Truth ; *Reformations carried on with* popular tumults, *rather then* rational con-

viction, *ſeldom end well*; *though the judgement of God be to be obſerved in powring contempt upon thoſe which are* partiall in his Law, *yet the* improvident Leapes, *which a people are wont to make upon ſuch occaſions, lay the foundation of a* laſting miſchief. *I hope that by the review of theſe matters wee ſhall come to know more of the Lords Counſell for the ordering of his* House, *or at leaſt that by weighing what may be ſaid on all ſides, we ſhall learn more to* *truth it in love, *which is the unfeigned deſire of him who is*

* Ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ. Eph. 4. 15.

Newington,
June 23. 1653.

Thine in the Lord,

THO. MANTON.

Moſt Honourable LORDS,
And ye the Knights, Citizens and Burgeſſes of the Honourable Houſe of COMMONS.

ALthough we doubt not, but that Book which was lately directed to your Honours, bearing the name of an *Humble Remonſtrance*, hath had acceſs unto your preſence: and is in the firſt approaches of it, diſcovered by your diſcerning ſpirits, to be neither *Humble*, nor a *Remonſtrance*, but a heap of confident and ungrounded Aſſertions; ſo that to your Honours a reply may ſeem ſuperfluous: Yet leſt the Author ſhould glory in our ſilence, as a granting of the cauſe; we humbly crave your *Honours* leave to preſent, not ſo much to your ſelves, as to the world by your hands, a view of this *Remonſtrance*; in which the Author after too large a *Preface*, undertakes the ſupport of two things, which ſeem to him to be threatned with danger of a preſent precipice, *the Liturgy, and Hierarchy.*

It was a conſtitution of thoſe admired ſons of Juſtice, the *Areopagi*; that ſuch as pleaded before them ſhould plead without *prefacing* & without *paſſion:* had your *Honours* made ſuch a conſtitution, this *Remonſtrance* muſt have been baniſhed from the face of your *Aſſebly*; for the *Preface* fils almoſt a fourth part of the Book, & the reſt ſwells with ſo many *Paſſionate Rhetorications*, as it is harder for us in the multitude of his words to find what his *argument* is that we have to *anſwer*, than to *anſwer* it when it is found. Ἄνευ πάθους καὶ ἄνευ προοιμίου.

We would not trace him in his words, but cloſe immediately with his Arguments: did we not find in him a ſad exemplification of that divine Axiom, *In multitudine verborum non deeſt peccatum, In the multitude of words there wants not ſin:* for though the Author is bold to call upon your *Honours* to hear the *words of truth and confidence*, yet how little truth there is in his great confidence, the enſuing diſcourſe ſhall diſcover. Pag. 23.

His very words are confident enough, and yet as falſe as confident; wherein he *impropriates all honeſty unto theſe his papers, and brands all others with the name of Libellers*, and yet himſelf ſins deeply againſt the rule of honeſty, and lies naked to the ſcourge of his own cenſure.

Firſt, In ſetting a brand upon all writings that have lately iſſued 1. Pag. 1.

issued from the Press, as if they had forgotten to speak *any other Language than* Libellous: it seems himself had *forgotten* that some things had issued by authority of *King* and *Parliament*.

2. Secondly, in taxing (implicitely) all such as will not own this Remonstrance for theirs, as *none of the peaceable and well-affected Sons of the Church of England.*

3. Page 2. Thirdly, in censuring the way of petitioning your Honours, the ancient and ordinary free way of seeking redress of our evills, for a *Tumultuary under-hand way.*

4. Page 3. Fourthly, in condemning all such as are not fautors of this *Episcopal cause*, as none of his Majesties good Subjects, engrossing that praise only to his own party, saying *The eyes of us, the good Subjects of this whole Realm, are fixed upon your Success*, &c.

5. Page 6. Fifthly, in *impropriating* to the same party the praise of *Orthodox*, *p. 6.* as if to speak a word, or think a thought against Episcopacy, were no less Heresie, than it was in former time to speak against the Popes supremacy, or the Monks fat belly; whereas whether the *Episcopal part* be the *Orthodox, peaceable, well-affected part, and his Majesties only good Subjects*, we *leave* to your Honours to judge, upon the numerous information that flow in unto you from the severall parts of this Kingdom.

Page 2. Nor can they decline your Judgement, *seeing now that you are (through Gods blessing)* happily met in a much *longed for Parliament*: but whether so much longed for by him and his accomplices, as by those against whom he whets his Style, the prayers that have obtained this happy meeting, and the praises that do attend it, will decide in this great day.

The *Helena*, whose Champion this Remonstrant chiefly is, is that *Government* which he calls *Sacred*, viz. That *Government by Arch bishops, Bishops, Deans, Arch deacons*, &c. which, saith he, through the sides of *some misliked persons, some have endeavoured to wound. Misliked persons?* & why not offending persons? why not guilty persons? when this *Honourable House hath found* just cause to charge some of the with crimes of the highest nature. Our zeal for your *Honours* makes us tear, lest your Assembly should suffer in this word; as if your proceedings against such persons should be grounded upō cōpliance with such as do mislike them, rather than upon their own demerits, or the Justice of this Court.

Page 7. Untruths. But whatever those persons be, the Goverment it self is Sacred; which by the *joynt confession of all reformed Divines, derives it self from the times of the blessed Apost. without any interruption, without contradiction*

contradiction of any Congregation in the world unto this preſent age. This is but an *Epiſcopall Bravado*, therefore we let it paſs, till we come to cloſe and contend with him in this poynt; where we ſhall demonſtrate, that in the compaſs of three lines he hath packt up as many untruths, as could be ſmoothly couched in ſo few words, as any man of common underſtanding, that lookes upon the face of the Government of almoſt all reformed Churches in the Chriſtian world may at firſt view diſcover.

But before we come to this, there are yet two things in this Preface which we count not unworthy obſervation. The *firſt* is, the compariſon which he makes between the two Governments, the Civil, which with us is *Monarchy*: & the Sacred which with him is *Epiſcopacy*. Of the firſt he ſaith, *if Antiquity may be the rule* (as he pleads it for Epiſcopacy) or if Scripture (as he interprets Scripture) it is VARIABLE, & ARBITRARY: but the other DIVINE & UNALTERABLE: ſo that had men petitioned for the altering of *Monarchial* Governmēt, they had (in his Judgemēt) been leſs culpable, both by Scripture & Antiquity, thā in petitioning the alteratiō of the *Hierarchichal*: Had he found but any ſuch paſſage in any of his *Lewd Libellers* (as his modeſty is always pleaſed to term th.m) certainly if we may borrow his own phraſe, the ears of the *Three intereſſed Kingdomes, yea all the Neighbour Churches, and if we may ſay, the whole Chriſtian world, and no ſmall part beyond it*, had run with cries of no leſs than *Treaſon, Treaſon.* Remon. Pag. 8.

Truth is, in his *Antiquity* we find that *this his uninterrupted ſacred Government* hath ſo far invaded the Civill, and ſo yoked Monarchy, even in this Kingdom, as *Malmesbury* reports: That *William Rufus oppreſſed by Biſhops*, perſwaded the *Jewes* to confute them; promiſing thereupon to turn *England* to their Religion, that he might be free of Biſhops. And this is ſo naturall an effect of *unalterable Epiſcopacy*, that *Pius* the fourth to the *Spaniſh* Embaſſadour, importuning him to permit Biſhops to be declared by the Councell of *Trent* to be *Jure Divino*, gave this Anſwer: That his King knew not what he did deſire; for if Biſhops ſhould be ſo declared, they would be all exempted from his Power, and as independent as the Pope himſelf. Malmesbury. Lib. 4. Hiſt. Concil. Trid.

The ſecond thing obſervable is the compariſon he makes between the late Alterations attempted in our Neighbour-Church by his Epiſcopall faction, and that *Alteration* that is now juſtly deſired by the *humble Petitioners* to this *honourable Houſe*. The one being attempted by ſtrangers, endeavouring violently to obtrude

trude *Innovations* upon a *ſetled Church* and *State*, the other *humbly petitioned* to the *Heads and Princes* of our State by *multitudes* therein *almoſt ruined by an innovating* Faction; yet doth not this Remonſtrant bluſh to ſay, if *theſe be branded* (ſo he calls the juſt cenſures of this Honourable Houſe) *for Incendaries, how ſhall theſe Bouteſeux eſcape*, &c Thus cunningly endeavouring either to juſtifie the former by the practiſe of the latter, or to render the latter more odious than the former.

Pag. 9.

The attempts of theſe men whom he would thus render odious, he craves leave to preſent to your Honours in two things, which are the Subjects of this quarrel; The *Liturgy* and *Epiſcopacy*; and we *humbly crave your Honours leave in both to anſwer.*

SECT. II.

Liturgy.

Pag. 10.

FIrſt *the Liturgy of the Church of* England (ſaith he) *hath been hitherto eſteemed ſacred, reverently uſed by holy Martyrs, daily frequented by devout Proteſtants, as that which more than once hath been confirmed by the Edicts of religious Princes, and your own Parliamentary Acts*, &c. And hath it ſo? whence then proceed theſe many *Additions* and *Alterations*? that have ſo changed the face and fabrick of the Liturgy, that as Dr. *Hall* ſpake once of the pride of *England*: if our fore-fathers ſhould revive and ſee their Daughters walking in *Cheapſide* with their Fans & Farthingales, &c. they would wonder what kind of Creatures they were; and ſay, Nature had forgot her ſelf, and brought forth a monſter: ſo if theſe holy Martyrs that once ſo reverently uſed the Liturgy, ſhould revive, and look for their Letany ſtampt by Authority of Parliament, they would be amazed, and wondering ſay, *England* had forgotten her ſelf, and brought forth, *&c.* Martyrs? what do we ſpeak of Martyrs, when we know, Sir, that one of your own (*a*) Biſhops ſaid it in the hearing of many not ſo long ſince, but you may well remember it, *That the ſervice of the Church of* England *was now ſo dreſt, that if the Pope ſhould come and ſee it, he would claim it as his own, but that it is in Engliſh?*

(a) *Ad hoc malorum devoluta eſt Eccleſia Dei & ſponſa Chriſti, ut hæreticorum exempla ſectentur, & ad celebranda Sacramenta cœleſtia, diſciplinam, Lux mutu tur de tenebris, & id faciant Chriſtiani quod Antichriſti faciunt.* Cypr. Ep. 74.

It is little then to the advantage of your cauſe, that you tell us, *it is tranſlated into other languages*; and as little ſervice have they done to the Church of *England*, who have taught our Prayers to ſpeak Latin again: for if it be their Language chiefly that overthrows the Popes claim, take away that, and what hinders then, but the Pope may ſay, *theſe are mine?*

As for other Tranſlations and the great applauſe it hath *obtained from forraign Divines*, which are the fumes this Remonſtrant vindi-

vindicates; what late dayes have produced we know not: but the great lights of former ages have been far from this applauding: we are sure judicious *Calvin* saith, that in the Liturgy there are sundry *Tolerabiles Ineptiæ*, wch we think is no very great applause

To vindicate this Liturgy from scorn (as he calls it) *at home*, or by your *Honours aid to re-inforce it upon the Nation*, is the work of his Remonstrance, for the effecting whereof he falls into *an unparalell'd* discourse about the Antiquity of Lyturgies; we call it *unparalell'd*, because no man that we have seen ever drew the line of Liturgy so high as he hath done. Pag. 13.

Concerning which, if by *Liturgy* this Remonstrant understand an *Order observed in Church Assemblies of praying, reading, and expounding the Scriptures, administring Sacraments*, &c. such a Liturgy we *know*, and do *acknowledge* both *Jews* and *Christians* have used. But if by Liturgy he understand prescribed and stinted forms of Administration *composed* by some particular men in the Church, and *imposed* upon all the rest (as this he must understand, or else all, he saith, is nothing) we desire and expect that those formes, which he saith *are yet extant, and ready to be produced, might once appear.*

Liturgy of this former sort we find in *Justine Martyr* and *Tertullian*. But that there were not such *stinted Liturgies* as this *Remonstrant* disputes for, appears by *Tertullian* in his *Apol. c.* 30. where he saith, the Christians of those times did in their publike assemblies pray *sine monitore quia de pectore, without any prompter but their own hearts.* And that so it should be, the same Father proves in his Treatise *de oratione*: *sunt quæ petantur*, &c. *There are some things to be asked according the occasions* of every man: *the lawfull and ordinary prayer (that is the Lords prayer) being laid as a foundation; It is lawful to build upon that foundation other prayers according to every ones occasion.* And to the same purpose St. *Austin* in his 121. *Ep. Liberum est, &c.* It is free to ask the same things that are desired in the Lords Prayer, *aliis atque aliis verbis*, sometimes one way, and sometimes another: And before this, in that famous place of *Just. Mar. Apo.* 2. *He, who instructed the people, prayed according to his ability.* Nor was this liberty in prayer taken away, and set and imposed formes introduced, until the time that the *Arrian* and *Pelagian* Heresies did invade the Church, and then because those Hereticks did convey and spread their poison in their formes of Prayer and Hymnes, the Church thought it convenient to restrain the liberty of making and

Just. Mar. Apost. 2. Tert. Ap. ad Gen. c. 39.

Just. Mar. Apost. 1. ὁ προεστὼς ὅσην δύναμις ἀναπέμπει.

and using publick formes; And first it ordained that none should pray *pro arbitio, sed semper eadem preces*, that none should use liberty to vary in prayer, but use alwayes the same form, *Conc. Load Can.* 18. yet this was a form of his own composing, as appears by another *Canon*, wherein it was ordered thus: None should use any form, unless he had first conferred *Cum fratribus instructioribus, with the more learned of his brethren, Conc. Carth.* 3. *Can.* 23. and lastly, that none should use set prayers, but such as were approved in a Synod, which was not determined till the year 416. *Conc. Milev.* 2. *Can.* 12. And had there been any Liturgies of times of the first, & most venerable antiquity producible, the great admirers of them, and enquirers after them, would have presented them to the world ere this.

Concil. Load. Can. 18.

Conc. Carth. 3. Can. 23. Anno 367.

Conc. Mil. 2. Canc 12. Anno 416.

We know that *Bishop Andrews* in his zeal for Liturgies, pursued the inquiry after the *Jewish Liturgy* so far that he thought he had found it; and one there was which he sent to *Cambidge* to be translated: but there it was soon discovered to have have been made long after the *Jews* ceased to be the Church of God; and so himself suppresst it, that it never saw the light under a translation.

We wonder therefore that this Remonstrant meant to affirm so confidently, that *part of the form of prayer, which was composed by our blessed Saviour, was borrowed from the formes of prayer formerly used by Gods people.* An opinion we never met before: indeed we have read that the *Rabbines* since the dayes of our Saviour, have borrowed some expressions from that prayer, and from other *Evangelical passages:* but we never read till now, that the *Lord Christ, the Wisdom of the Father*, borrowed from the *wisdom of the Rabbines* expressions to use in prayer.

Pap. 10.

And as much we wonder by what *Revelation* or *Tradition* (Scripture being silent in the thing) he knew, that *Peter* and *John*, when they went up to the Temple to pray, their prayer was not of a *sudden and extemporary conception, but of a regular prescription.* Sure we are, some as well read in *Jewish Antiquity*, as this Remonstrant shews himself to be, have told us that the hour of Prayer was the time when the Priest burnt incence, and the people were at their private Prayers without, as appears *Luk.* 1. 9. where we read, that while *Zachary* the Priest went in t offer Incense, all the people stood without praying in the time of the Oblation. Which Prayers were so farr from being *prescript Forms* or Liturgies, that they were not *vocal* but *mental* Prayers, as Master *Mead* tells us in his exposition upon the eighth of the *Revelations.*

Pap. 11.

And

And what ever *Peter* and *John* did, this we know, that when the Publican and the Phariſe went up to the Temple to pray (as the Apoſtle did at the hour of prayer) their prayer *was not of Regular preſcription, but of a preſent Conception.* Page 18.

But if this Remonſtrant be in the right, concerning the Jewiſh Liturgies, then the Evangelical Church might better *have improved her peace and happineſs, then in compoſing Models of Invocation and Thankſgiving*; when there is one *extant and ready to be produced, that was conſtantly uſed by Gods people, ever ſince Moſes dayes, and put over to the times of the Goſpel, and confirmed by Apoſtolical practice:* or elſe great is our loſſe, who are ſo unhappily deprived of the beſt *improvement the Church made of her peace & happineſs in the firſt* 300 years: for rejecting thoſe *Liturgies* that are confeſſed by the Learned to be *Spurious:* we *challenge* this *Remonſtrant* to produce any one *Liturgie* that was the iſſue of thoſe times. And bleſſed *Conſtantine* was herein as unhappy as we, who needed not have compoſed forms of prayer for his Guard to uſe upon the Lords day, but might and would have taken them out of former Liturgies, if there had been any; *And can ye with patience thinke that any ingenuous Chriſtian ſhould be ſo tranſported*, as upon ſuch weak and unproved *premiſes* to build ſuch a *Confident Concluſion*, as this Remonſtrant doth? And in that *Concluſion* forget the ſtate of the controverſie, ſliding from the queſtion of a *preſcribed and impoſed Liturgie* to an arbitrary book of prayer. Page 11. *Euſeb. de vit. Con li. 4. cap. 18* Page 11.

In his *Rhetorical Encomium of conceived prayer* we ſhall more willingly bear a part with him, than they whoſe cauſe he pleads; for had not that been in their *hearts*, which is in this book: *to hate to be guilty of pouring water upon the Spirit, and gladly to adde oyle rather:* ſo many learned, able, Conſcientious *Preachers* had not been moleſted and ſuſpended, for *letting the conſtant flames of their fixed conception mount up from the altar of their zealous heart unto the throne of grace*: nor had there been ſo many advantages watched from ſome ſtops aud ſeeming *ſolœciſmes* in ſome mens prayers, to *blaſpheme the ſpirit of Prayer*, which thongh now confeſt to be ſo *far from being offenſive, that they are as pleaſing Muſick in the eares of the Almighty*: yet time hath been, when they have ſounded as meer *Battologies*; nay no better than meer *Blaſphemies* in the ears of ſome Biſhops. Page 12. Pag. 12. Pag. 12.

And if this conceived prayer be not to be oppoſed in another, by any man that hath found the true operation of this grace in himſelfe: with what ſpirit then are thoſe poſſeſt, that have not Pag. 13.

only thus raged with their tongues againſt this way of prayer, but by ſealing up the mouths of Miniſters for praying thus in publick, and impoſing penances upou private Chriſtians for praying thus in their families: and compelling them to abjure this practice, have endeavoured with raging violence to baniſh this divine Ordinance from our Churches and dwellings, and profeſt in open Court, it was fitter for *Amſterdam* than for our Churches.

D. Corbet.
M. Nevel.

But howſoever this applauſe of conceived prayer may ſeem to be Cordiall, yet he makes it but a *vantage ground* to lift up *publique formes of ſacred Church Liturgy* (as he calls it) the higher, that they may have the greater *honour*, that by the *power of your authority they may be reinforced*, which work there would have been no need to call your *Honours* to, had not *Epiſcopall zeale* broke forth into ſuch flames of indignation againſt conceived prayers, that we have more juſt cauſe to implore the *propitious aide* of the ſame *Authority* to *re-eſtabliſh the Liberty of this*, than they to *reinforce* the neceſſity of that.

Pag. 13.

Yet there are two ſpecious Arguments which this Remonſtrant brings to perſwade this deſired re-inforcement, the Originall and Confirmation of our Liturgy.

For the firſt, he tells your *Honours*, it was *ſelected out of ancient Models not* Roman *but* Chriſtian, *contrived by the holy Martyrs and Confeſſors of the bleſſed reformation of Religion*; where we beſeech your *Honours* to conſider how we may truſt theſe men, who ſometimes ſpeaking and writing of the *Roman* Church, proclaim it a true Church of *Chriſt*, and yet here *Roman* and *Chriſtian* ſtand in oppoſition: ſometimes they tell men, their Liturgy is wholly taken out of the *Roman Miſſal*, only with ſome little alteration: and here they would perſwade your Honours there is nothing *Roman* in it. But it is wholly ſelected out of pure *Ancient Models*, as the *Quinteſſence* of them all. Whereas alas the originall of it, is publiſhed to the world, in that Proclamation of *Edward* the ſixth.

Pag. 13.

And though here they pleaſe to ſtile the Compoſers of it, *holy Martyrs and contrivers of that bleſſed Reformation*: yet there are *of the Tribe for whom he pleads*, not a few, that have called them *Traitors* rather than *Martyrs*, and *Deformers* rather than *Reformers* of our Religion.

His other Argument for the Liturgy is taken from that *ſupply of ſtrength it hath received from the recommendation of four moſt Religious Princes, and your own Parliamentary eſtabliſhments: and more eſpecially*

especially from the proclamation of King James *of famous memory*? the validity of which plea, your Honours are best able to judge, and therefore we leave it at your Bar; yet these two things we know: first that this *form* was never *established* to be so *punctually observed*, so *rigorously pressed*, to the *casting out of all that scruple it, or any thing in it* (as many of his Majesties Subjects now do) to the (*almost*) justling out of the *preaching of the word* & *conceived prayers altogether*.

And secondly, as sure as we are, that your *Honours* think neither your own Laws, nor the Proclamation of that *most famous and ever admired Prince*, to be as unalterable as the Laws of the *Medes* and *Persions*.

And now having briefly shewed, that *Liturgies* are not of that *antiquity* that this *Remonstrant* pretends, but that *conceived prayer* was in *use* in the Church of God before *Liturgies*, and is *justified from their own mouths*, & not to be *found fault with by any but a graceless man*: and having likewise shewed that *our Liturgy was taken* out of Models, not only *Christian* but *Roman*, & had since the first compiling of it suffered *alteration* to the *worse*; and though *established by Law*, and confirmed by Proclamation, was never intended to the justling out, either of preaching or conceived prayer, these things declared, we humbly crave your Honours leave to propound these 2. *Queries*.

QUERE. I.

Whether it be not fit to consider of the alteration of the present Liturgy.

1. Because it symbolizeth so much with the Popish Mass, as that the Pope himself was willing to have it used, if he might but confirm it. 1.

It was made and composed into this frame, on purpose to bring the Papists to our Churches, which we find to be with so little 2.
success, as that it hath rather brought many of us to them, than any of them to us, and hath lost many of ours from us.

Because many things therein contained are stumbling blocks be- 3.
fore the feet of many: such as these, the clogging it with Ceremonies, and the often and impertinent reiterating of the Lords prayer, the ill translation of the Psalmes, and other Scriptures, the many phrases in the very prayers, which are liable to just exception. And whereas the Minister by the Scripture is the peoples mouth to God, this Book prescribes Responsories to be said by the people, some of which are unsuitable to what the Minister pronounceth, some of them seem to savour of Tautology, some are made to be so essential

to the prayer, as that all which the Minister saith, is no prayer without them; as in the *Letany*.

4. Because it is so much Idolized, as that it is accompted the only worship of God in *England*, and is now made the upholder of a non-preaching Ministery, and is cryed up to that height, as that some are not ashamed to say; that the wit of Men and Angels cannot mend it: and that it is a sufficient discharge of the Ministers duty to read this Book.

Abbot against Church-forsakers.

5. There are such multitudes of people, that distaste this Book, that unless it be altered, there is no hope of any mutuall agreement between Gods Ministers and their people.

6. There is such a vast difference between it, and the Liturgies of all other reformed Churches, as that it keeps them at a distance from us, and us from full Communion with them.

QUERE II.

1. Whether the first reformers of Religion did ever intend the use of a Liturgy further, than to be an help in the want, or to the weakness of a Minister.

2. All other reformed Churches, though they use Liturgies, yet do not bind their Ministers to the use of them.

3. A Rubrick in *King Edwards* book left it unto the discretion of the Minister, what and how much to read, when there was a Sermon.

4. The Homilies which are appointed to be read, are left free either to be read or not, by preaching Ministers; and why not then the Liturgy? especially considering that the ability to offer up the peoples wants to God in prayer is part of the Ministeriall office, as well as preaching. And if it can be thought no less than sacriledge to rob the people of the Ministers gift in preaching, and to tye them to Homilies, it can be no less, to deprive them of their gift in prayer.

5. The ground of the first binding of it upon all to use, was not to tye godly men from exercising their gift in prayer; but all the old Popish Priests, that by a seeming return to our Religion did through indulgence retain their places, from returning to the old Mass.

That which makes many refuse to be present at our Church-service, is not only the Liturgy it self, but the imposing of it upon Ministers. And we find no way to recover our people to a stinted prayer, but leaving it free to use or not to use.

If

If it be objected that this will breed diviſions and diſturbances in Churches, unleſs there be a uniformity, and that there are many unable

Objection.

It hath not bred any diſturbance in other reformed Churches.

Anſwer.

Why ſhould the free liberty of uſing or not uſing a Liturgy, breed more confuſion than the free liberty of reading or not reading Homilies? eſpecially when Miniſters ſhall teach people, not to condemn one another in things indifferent.

2.

If there be a care taken in thoſe that have the power to make Miniſters, to chooſe men gifted as well for prayer as preaching, there cannot be conceived how any inconvenience ſhould follow. Or if afterwards it ſhould appear, that any Miniſter ſhould prove inſufficient to diſcharge the duty of prayer in a conceived way, it may be impoſed on him as a puniſhment, to uſe ſet forms and no other. But why any Miniſter that hath the gift of prayer, in an abundant meaſure, as well as of preaching, ſhould be hindred from exerciſing his gift well, becauſe another uſeth it ill, is a new Divinity never heard of in Gods Church, till Biſhop *Wrens* dayes, who forbad all uſe of conceived prayer in the Church.

3.

SECT. III.

WE come now with your *Honours favour*, to the ſecond point diſputed in this Remonſtrance, *Epiſcopacy it ſelf*, againſt which whatſoever hath been either ſpoken or written by any, either *learned Divines*, or *well-reformed Churches* (as his conſcience knows, there are of both that writ againſt it) is taxed by him as no other than the *unjuſt Clamours either of weak or factious perſons*. Sure the man thinks he hath obtained a *Monopoly* of learning, and all *Knowledge* is lockt up in his *boſome*; and not onely *Knowledge* but *piety* and *peaceableneſs* too; for all that are not of his opinion, muſt ſuffer either as weak or factious, if he may be their Judge. We know not what his Arrogancy might attempt to faſten upon your *Honours*, ſhould the *bowels* of your compaſſion be inlarged, to weigh in the Ballance of your wiſdomes, the *multitude* of *Humble Petitions*, preſented to you from ſeveral parts of this Kingdom, that hath long groaned under the Iron and Inſupportable yoake of this *Epiſcopall Government*, which yet we do not, but your *Honours* will pleaſe to take into your prudent and pious conſideration: Eſpecially knowing it is their continuall practiſe to load with the odious names of *Faction* all that juſtly complain of their *unjuſt oppreſſion*.

Pag. 17.

Pag. 17.

In

In his addreſs to his defence of Epiſcopacy, he makes an unhappy confeſſion *that he is confounded in himſelf.* Your Honours may in this believe him; for he that reads this remonſtrance, may eaſily obſerve ſo many falſities and contradictions, (though preſented to publick view, with a face of confident boldneſs,) as could not fall from the Pen of any, but *a ſelf-confounded man*; which though we doubt not but *your Honours* have deſcryed; yet becauſe they are hid from an errant & obſerving eye, under the Embroyderies of a ſilkē Language, we Humbly crave your Honours leave to put them one by one upon the file, that the world may ſee what credit is to be given to the bold aſſertion of this confident Remonſtrant.

Pag. 17.

1.

* Pag 2. a One of theſe Sonnes of the Church of *England* whoſe meſſenger this Remonſtrant is, was he who ſwore by the Eternal God, he would be the death of thoſe that did appear to move againſt the grievances of Epiſcopacy; & if the reſt of theſe Millions mentioned page 2, whoſe thouſands are ſo punctually calculated p. 41. be of his ſpirit, they are an army of very peaceable & right affected men.

First, in his ſecond page, he dubs his book * *the faithful meſſenger of all* (a) *the peaceable and right affected ſons of the Church of England*: which words (beſides that unchriſtian *Theta*, which as we already obſerved, they ſet upon all that are not of his party) carry in the bowells of thē a notorious falſity & contradiction to the praiſe of this Book; for how could this book be the meſſenger of all his *own party* in England, when it is not to be imagined, that all could know of the coming forth of this book before it was publiſhed? and how can this book crave admittance in *all their names*, that ſpeaks in the ſingular number, and as in the perſon of one man almoſt that whole book thorow.

But it may be ſome will ſay, this is but a ſmall ſlip; well, be it ſo: but in the ſeventh page he layes it on in four lines, aſſerting theſe 4. things: First that *Epiſcopal government*, (that very ſame Epiſcopal government, which ſome *he ſaith ſeek to wound*, that is government by a Dioceſan Biſhop) derives it ſelf from the Apoſtles times; which though we ſhall σὺν θεῷ more fully confute anon, yet we cannot here but rank it amongſt his notorious ——: for how could there be ſuch government of a Dioceſs by a Biſhop derived from the Apoſtles times, when in the Apoſtles times there were no Biſhops diſtinct frō presbyters, as we ſhall ſhew? and if there had been Biſhops, yet they were no Dioceſans; for it was a hundred years after Chriſt, or as moſt agree 260 before pariſhes were diſtinguiſhed, and there muſt be a diſtinction of pariſhes before there could be an union of them into Dioceſſes.

2.

Pag. 7 *Evariſtus.* 100. *Dionyſius.* 260. Some ſay 267. as *Pol. Virg. Pag.* 13, 14.

Secondly, it is by *the joynt confeſſion of all reformed Divines granted, that this ſacred Government is derived from the Apoſtles*: What all reformed Divines? was *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Junius*, &c. of that mind? Are the reformed Churches of *France*, *Scotland*, *Netherlands*, of that Judgement? we ſhall ſhew anon that there is no more

more truth in this Assertion then if he had said with *Anaxagoras*, snow is black, or with *Copernicus*, the Earth moves, and the Heavens stand still.

Thirdly, he saith this *Government hath continued without any interruption*: What doth he meane, at *Rome*? for we read in some places of the world this Government was never known for many years together: as in *Scotland*, we read that in ancient Times the *Scots* were instructed in the Christian Faith by Priests and Monkes, and were without Bishops 290 years: yea, to come to *England*, we would desire to know of this Remonstrant whether God had a Church in *England* in Qu. *Maries* dayes or no? and if so, who were then the Bishops of this Church, for some there must be, if it be true that this man saith, this Government hath continued without any interruption unto this day, and Bishops then we know not where to finde but in the line of Popish succession. 3 *John Maior l. 2: Hist de gest. Scot. cap. 2.*

Fourthly, he saith it hath thus continued *without the contradiction of any one Congregation in the Christian world.* It seems he hath forgotten what their own darling *Heylin* hath written of the people of *Biscay* in *Spain*, that they admit of no Bishops to come among them; for when *Ferdinand* the Catholick came in progresse accompanied among others with the Bishop of *Pampelone*, the people rose up in Armes, drove back the Bishop, and gathering up all the dust which they thought he had trode on, flung it into the Sea. *Heylins Geog. p. 55.*

Which story had it been recorded only by him, would have been of lighter credit. But we read the same in the Spanish Chronicle, who saith more than the Doctor: for he tells us that the People that threw that dust that the Bishop or his Mule had trode on, into the sea with *Curses and imprecations*: which certainly, saith he, was not done without some *Mystery*, those people not being void of Religion, but superstitiously devout as the rest of the *Spaniards* are: so that there is one Congregation in the Christian world which this Government hath met with contradiction. *Gener. Hist. of Spain l. 22.*

And are not the *French*, *Scotish*, and *Belgick* Churches worthy to be counted Christan Congregations? and who knows not that amongst these this Government hath met not only with verball but reall contradiction?

Yet he cannot leave his —— but within two pages is at it again: and *tels us of an unquestionable clearnesse wherein it hath been from the Apostles derived to us*: how unquestionable? when 6 *Page 9.*

the

the many volumes written about it, witneſſe to the world, and to his *conſcience*, it hath been as much queſtioned as any point (almoſt) in our Religion.

7. And that aſſertion of his that tels us, that the people of God *had a forme of prayer as ancient as Moſes, which was conſtantly practiſed to the Apoſtles dayes, and by the Apoſtles*, &c. though we have ſhewed how bold and falſe this aſſertion is, yet we mention it here, as deſerving to be put into the Catalogue.

8. And that he may not ſeem *Contra mentem ire*, but to be of the
Page 18. ſame mind ſtill, *p.* 18. he ſaith, *Epiſcopal Government hath continued in this Iſland ever ſince the firſt plantation of the Goſpel without contradiction.* Had he taken a leſſe ſpace of time, and ſaid but ſince the *reſuſcitation* of the Goſpel, we can prove it to him and ſhall, that ſince the reformation, Epiſcopacy hath been more contradicted, than ever the Papacy was before the extirpation of it.

9. Yet ſtill the man runs on, thinking to get credit to his untruths by their multiplications; for *pag.* 21. he ſaith, *Certainly except all Hiſtories, all Authors faile us, nothing can be more certain than this truth: Os Durum!* Nothing more certain! what is it not more certain there is a God? or is it not more certain that Chriſt is God and man? is it not more certain that Chriſt is the only Saviour of the world? Nothing more certain! muſt this then be an Article of our Creed, the corner ſtone of our Religion? muſt this be of neceſſity to ſalvation? nothing more certain! O that men ſhould not only forget themſelves, but God alſo: and in their zeal for their Honour utter words bordering upon *Blaſphemy*.

Indignation will not ſuffer us to proſecute theſe falſities of his any further; we will leave this diſpleaſing ſervice, only retorting the words of this Remonſtrant upon himſelf, *Surely could he looke with*
Page 18. *our eyes* (or any eyes that were not partiall) *he would ſee cauſe to be throughly aſhamed of theſe his groſſe injurious miſcarriages, and ſhould be forced to confeſs, that never good cauſe* (if cauſe be good) *had more reaſon to complain of a ſinful proſecution.*

SECT. IV.

WEe will now come with your Honours patience, to weigh whether there be any more ſtrength in his arguments, then there is truth in his aſſertions.

His Plea for Epiſcopacy conſiſts of two parts. In the firſt he brings

brings arguments for the ſupporting of it. In the ſecond he undertakes to anſwer the objections that may be made againſt it.

His firſt argument for it, is couched in theſe words, *Were this Ordinance meerly humane or Eccleſiaſtical, if there could no more be ſaid for it, but that it is exceeding antient, of more then 15. hundred years*, &c. The ſtrength of which argument lies in this, that they have been in peaceable poſſeſſion of this Government fifteen hundred years and upward; and in this Iſland ever ſince the Goſpell, without contradiction.

In which words he ſpeaks two things which deſerve juſt cenſure; Firſt, that the Hierarchicall Government hath continued for fifteen hundred years; therefore ſhould not now be altered; which may well be called, as *Hierom* in another caſe, *Argumentum Galeatum, an Argument calculated for the Meridian of Epiſcopacy, and may indifferently ſerve for all Religions in the world*: For thus the *Jews* might have pleaded againſt Chriſt the antiquity of more then ſo many hundred years; and thus the Heathens did plead againſt Chriſtian Religion, which *Juſtin Martyr* in his Apology anſwers. And by this Argument the Pope ſit as faſt riveted in his chair at *Rome*, as ours in theirs: whoſe Plea for Antiquity runs parallel with theirs. It is a good obſervation of *Cyprian*, that Chriſt ſaid, *Ego ſum via, veritas & vita*; not *Ego ſum*; and * that *Conſuetudo ſine veritate eſt vetuſtas erroris*, Chriſt is Truth, and not Cuſtom; and Cuſtom without Truth, is as mouldy errour: and as Sir *Francis Bacon* ſaith, *Antiquity without Truth, is a Cypher without a figure.*

Yet had this (*b*) Remonſtrant been as well verſed in Antiquity, as he would bear the world in hand, he hath, he might have found learned Antients affirming, there was a time when the Church was not governed by Biſhops but by Presbyters. And when by Biſhops, he might further have ſeen more affinity between our Biſhops and the Pope of *Rome*, than between the primitive Biſhops and them. And that as King *James* of famous memory, ſaid of the Religion of *England*, that it differed no more from *Rome*, than *Rome* did from what it was at firſt; may as truly be ſaid of Biſhops, that we differ no more from them, than they do from what Biſhops were, when firſt they were raiſed unto this Eminency; which difference we ſhall ſhew in our enſuing Diſcourſe, to be ſo great, as he that ſaid of *Rome*, he did *Romam in Roma quærere*, he ſought *Rome* in *Rome*, ſo we *Epiſcopatum in Epiſcopatu*, may go ſeek for a *Biſhop among all our Biſhops.*

* *Fruſtra conſuetudinem nobis opponunt, quaſi conſuetudo major ſit veritate, aut non id ſit in ſpiritualibus ſequendum, quod in melius fuerit à Spiritu Sancto Revelatum.* Cy. Epiſt. 73.

(*b*) It is well obſerved by *Gerhard*, that a Biſhop *Phraſi Apoſtolicâ*, that is, the Biſhop that is the ſame with a Presbyter, is of fifteen hundred years ſtanding; but a Biſhop of *Phraſi Pontificia*, that is, a diſtinct order ſuperiour to a Presbyter, inveſted with ſole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, is but a Novell Invention.

And whereas in his application of this argument to the Biſhops of this Nation, he ſaith, *It hath continued in this Iſland ever ſince the firſt plantation of the Goſpel without contradiction*, which is his *Second* in this Argument: How falſe is this, we have declared already; and we all know, and himſelf cannot but know, that there is no one thing ſince the Reformation, that hath met with ſo much *Contradiction* as *Epiſcopacy* hath done; witneſs the ſeveral Books written in the reigns of our ſeveral Princes, and the many *Petitions* exhibited to our ſeverall *Parliaments*, and the many ſpeeches made there in againſt *Epiſcopal Government*: many of which are yet extant.

Page 19

As for that ſupply of Acceſſory ſtrength, which he begs to this Argument, from the *light of Nature, & the rules of juſt poliey, which* ſaith he, *teacheth us not eaſily to give way to the change of thoſe things, which long uſe and many* * *Laws have firmly eſtabliſhed, as neceſſary and beneficiall*; it is evident, that thoſe things which to former ages have ſeemed *neceſſary* and *beneficial*, may to ſucceeding generations, prove not *neceſſary* but *noxious*, not *beneficial* but *burthenſome*. And then the ſame light *of Nature*, and the ſame *juſt policy*, that did at the firſt command the eſtabliſhment of them, may, and will perſwade their *Abolition*; if not, either our Parliaments muſt never repeal any of their former Acts (which yet they have juſtly and wiſely done) or elſe in ſo doing, muſt run Counter to the *Light of Nature*, and the *Rules of juſt policy*; which to think were an Impiety to be puniſhed by the Judge.

Page 19. * What the Eſtabliſhment of Epiſcopacy by the Laws is, and upon what grounded, the learned Sr. *Edward* Cook informs us, who reports, That in the Act of Parliament, holden at *Carlile* in the 25. year of *Edward* the I. it is declared; that the Holy Church of *England* was founded in the ſtate of prelacy within the Realm of *England*, by the King and his progenitors, &c. for them to inform the people in the Law of God, and to keep hoſpitality, and give Almes, and do other works of Charity. And the ſaid Kings in times paſt were wont to have their advice and counſel for the ſafe-guard of the Realm, when they had need of ſuch Prelates and Clarks ſo advanced: *Cook de jure Regis Eccleſiaſtico.* But whether Biſhops have obſerved the Orders of their firſt foundation, &c.

SECT V.

Pag. 19, 20. THe Second Argument for the defence of Epiſcopal Government, is from the *Pedigree of this holy Calling, which he derives from no leſs than an Apoſtolical, and in that right divine inſtitution*; and eſſayes to prove it from the practiſe of the Apoſtles, and as he ſaith, that *clear practiſe of their Succeſſors, continued in Chriſts Church to this very day*: And this Argument he ſo much confides in, that he concludes it with this *Triumphant Epiphonema, What ſcruple can remain in any ingenious heart?* and determines, *If any continue yet unſatisfied,*

unſatisfied, it is in deſpight of reaſon, and all evidence of Hiſtory, and becauſe he willfully ſhuts his eyes with a purpoſe not to ſee the light. Pag. 21. Bona verba.

But by your favour Sir, we will tell you, notwithſtanding the ſuppoſed ſtrength of your argumentation, there is one ſcruple yet remaining; and if you would know uponwhat ground, it is this, becauſe we find in Scripture (which by your own confeſſion is *Originall Authority*) that Biſhops and Presbyters were *Originally* the ſame, though afterwards they came to be diſtinguiſhed: and in proceſs of time, Epiſcopacy did ſwallow up all the *honor* and *power* of the Preſbytery, as *Pharoah*'s lean Kine did the fat. Page 8.

Their Identity is diſcernable; firſt, from the ſame names given unto both: ſecondly, from the ſame office deſigned unto both in Scripture. As for the names, are not the ſame names given unto both in Sacred Writ? Let the fifth, ſixth, and ſeventh verſes of the firſt Chapter to *Titus* teſtifie: In the fifth verſe, the Apoſtle ſhews that he left *Titus* in *Crete* to ordain Elders in every City: in the ſixth verſe, he gives a delineation of the perſons that are capable of ſuch Ordination: & in the ſeventh, the Reaſon, why the perſon to be ordained, muſt be ſo qualified: for a *Biſhop*, *&c.* Now if the Biſhop and Elder be not here the ſame, but names of diſtinct office and order, the Apoſtles reaſon in the 7th. verſe of his direction in the fifth and ſixth verſes, is (with reverence be it ſpoken) inconſequentiall, and his demand unjuſt. If a Chancellor in one of the Univerſities ſhould give order to his Vice-chancellor to admit none the degree of Batchelour in Arts, but ſuch as were able to preach, or keep a Divinity Act for *Batchelours* in *Divinity muſt be ſo*: what reaſon or equity were in this? ſo if *Paul* leaving *Titus* as his *Locum tenens*, as it were in *Creet* for a ſeaſon, ſhould give order to him not to admit any to be an *Elder* but one thus & thus qualified, becauſe a Biſhop muſt be ſo: had a Biſhop been an order or calling diſtinct from, or ſuperior to a Presbyter, and not the ſame, this had been no more rationall or equal than the former: therefore under the name of Biſhop in the 7.v. the Apoſtle intends the Elder mentioned in the 5.v. Conſonant to this is the Language of the ſame Apoſtle, *Acts* 20.v.17,28. where ſuch as in v.17. he calls πρεσβυτέρους, *Elders*; in the 18. he calls ἐπισκόπους, in ordinary Engliſh, *Biſhops*, though our Tranſlation there, (we know not for what reaſon) reads it *Overſeers*: not ſo rendring the word in any other Text.

And though this Remonſtrant undertakes to ſhew a clear received diſtinction of Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons, *as three diſtinct and ſubordinate Callings in Gods Church, with an evident ſpecification of the duty and charge belonging to each of them, or elſe let this claimed Hierarchy be for ever hooted out of the Church*: Yet let us tell him, that we never find in Scripture theſe three Orders, *Biſhops, Presbyters* and *Deacons*, mentioned together, but only *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, as *Phil.* 1. and 1 *Tim.* Nor do we find in Scripture any *Ordination* to the office of a Biſhop frō the *Ordination* of an Elder; Nor do we find in Scripture the ſpecification of any Duty charged upon a Biſhop that Elders are ſecluded from: Nor any qualification required in a Biſhop, that is not requiſite in *every Presbyter*; ſome of which, if not all, would be found, were they not the ſame.

But if this *Remonſtrant* think to help himſelf by taking Sanctuary in *Antiquity* (though we would gladly reſt in Scripture, the Sanctuary of the Lord) yet we will follow him thither, and there ſhew him that *Hierom* from the Scriptures proves more than once, *Presbyters* and *Biſhops* to be the ſame. And *Chryſ.* in *Phil.* 1. *Homil.* 2. with his Admirer *Theophylact.* in *Phil.* 1. affirmes, that while the Apoſtles lived, the names of *Biſhops* and *Presbyters* were not diſtinguiſhed, & not only while the Apoſtles lived, but in after ages. Doth not *Irenæus* uſe the name of *Biſhops* and *Presbyters* διαχρίτως, in a promiſcuous ſenſe? Are not *Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Teleſphorus, Sixtus*, whom the Papiſts call Biſhops and the Popes Predeceſſors, termed by *Euſebius* Presbyters? Nor was it ſtrange in the Primitive times to hear Biſhops called Presbyters, when Presbyters, writing to their Biſhops, have called him *Frater*. So *Cyp.* (*Ep.* 26. in the beginning) is ſtiled by his Presbyters, Deacons and Confeſſors; nor was the holy Martyr offended with that title, nor they condemned of inſolency that uſed it.

Hieron. Epi ad Evan: & ad Occa.

Iren. adver. hær. lib. 4. cap. 43, 44.

Hiſt. Lib. 5. cap. 23.

But what ſhould we burthen your patience with more teſtimonies when the evidence of this Truth hath ſhined with ſo ſtrong a beam, that even our *Adverſaries* have ſtooped to it, and confeſſed that their *Names* were the ſame in the Apoſtles time? but yet, ſay they, the Offices were diſtinct.

Bel de Cler. l. 1 cap. 15.

Now here we would gladly know, what theſe men make the diſtinct Office of a Biſhop.

Is it to edifie the Church by Word and Sacrament? is it to ordain others to that work? is it to rule, to govern, by admonition and other cenſures? If any of theſe, if all theſe make up the proper

proper work of a Bishop; we can prove from Scripture that these belong unto the Prebytery, which is no more then was granted by a Councel.

Presbyteris sicut Episcopis Dispensatio Mysteriorum Dei commissa est: Præsunt enim Ecclesiæ Christi; in consecratione Dominici Corporis & sanguinis, consortes sunt cum Episcopis: & similiter in Doctrina Populorum, & in officio prædicandi; ac solum propter autoritatem, summo Sacerdoti Clericorum Ordinatio reservata est. Concil. Aquisgran primum, Can 8.

Evangelium tribuit his qui præsunt Ecclesiæ Mandatum docendi Evangelii, remittendi peccata, administrandi Sacramenta: præterea jurisdictionem, videlicet Mandatum excommunicandi eos quorum nota sunt crimina, & resipiscentes rursum absolvendi: Ac omnium Confessione, etiam adversariorum liquet, hanc potestatem Jure Divino *communem esse* Omnibus *qui præsunt Ecclesiæ, sive Pastores vocentur sive Presbyteri sive Episcopi. Scriptum* Philip. Melanch. *in conventu Smalcald. Anno 1540. à præcipuis illarum Ecclesiarum Doctoribus communi Consensu comprobatum de potestate & jurisdictione Episcoporum.*

For the first edifying of the Church by Word & Sacramēts, though we fear they will some of them at least scarce own this as *their proper work* (for some have been cited into the *High Commission* for saying, it belongs to them) yet Sir we are sure, Scripture makes it a *part*, a *chief* of the Episcopal Office, for so in 1 *Pet.* 5. 2 they are said to do the work of a Bishop, when they do feed the flock of God. And this is such a work as *we* hope their *Lordships* will give the poor Presbyters leave to share with them in: or if not, we will tell them that the Ap. *Peter* in that forecited place, and the Ap. *Paul, Acts* 20 binds this work upon our hands, and *Woe unto us if we preach not the Gospell.* 1. Ἐπισκοπῆν. ποίμανον.

But this branch of Episcopall and Presbyterial office we pass with brevity, because in this there lyes not so much controversie as in the next, which they do more wholly *impropriate* to themselves: the power of Ordination.

Which power, that it was in former times in the hands of *Presbyters*, appears 1 *Tim* 4. 14. *Neglect not the gift which was given thee by Prophecy, and by the laying on the hands of the Prebytery.* The gift here spoken of is the Ministerial gift, the exercise whereof, the Apostle exhorts *Timothy* not to neglect, which saith he, he had received, not by the laying on of the hands of one single man, whether *Apostle*, or *Bishop*, or *Presbyter*, but τὸ πρεσβυτηρίου, the Presbytery, that is, the *whole company* of Presbyters, for in that sence only we find τὸ πρεσβυτήριον taken in Scripture, as in *Luk.* 22 *v.* 66. *Act.* 22. *v.* 5. which the Christian Church called the *Ecclesiastical Senate*, as *Jerom* in *Is.* 3. *Nos habemus in Ecclesia Senatum nostrum, Cœtum Presbyterorum*, and an *Apostolical* Senate, συνέδριον Ἀποστόλων *Ignatius Epis. ad Magnes*, and some times πρεσβυτήριον *Con. Ancyr. Can.* 18.

And though the Apostle in his second Epistle to *Tim.* 1. 6. makes mention of the laying on of his hands: yet to maintain the Harmony of Scripture, it must not be denyed but there was imposition of hands by the Presbytery as well as by himself, and so it was a joynt act; So that in this there is no more difference then in the former. And

Jerom Isa. 3. *Ignat. Epist. ad Magnes. Conc. Ancyr. Can.* 18.

And if there be no difference between Presbyters in feeding or Ordaining, let us see if there be any in the third part of their office of *Ruling*, which though our *Bishops* assume wholly to themselves, yet we shall discover, that it hath been committed o and exercised by *Presbyterial* hands.

For who are they of whom the Scripture speaks, *Heb.* 13.17. *Obey them that have the Rule over you: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give an account*, &c.

Here all such as watch over the Souls of Gods people, are intituled to *rule* over them. So that unless *Bishops* will say, that they *only watch* over the Souls of Gods people, and are *only to give an account* for them, they cannot challenge to themselves the *sole rule* over them. And if the *Bishops* can give us good security, that they will acquit us from *giving up our account to God* for the Souls of his people, we will quit our plea, and resign to them the sole rule over them.

So again, in 1 *Thess.* 5.12. *Know them which labour amongst you and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you.*

In which words are contained these truths: First that in one Church (for the *Thessalonians* were but Church, 1 *Ca.*) there was not ὁ προϊστάμενος but οἱ προϊστάμενοι, not *one chief Bishop* or *President*, but the *Presidency was in many.*

2. Secondly, that this *Presidency* was of such as laboured in the Word and Doctrine.

3. Thirdly, that the Censures of the Church were managed not by one, but by them all in *Communi. Them that admonish you.*

4. Fourthly, that there was among them a *Parity*: for the Apostle bids *know them* in an *indifferency*, not discriminating one from another; yea such was the Rule that Elders had, that St. *Peter* thought it needful to make an exhortation to them to use their power with *Moderation*, not *Lording it over Gods Heritage*, 1 Peter 5.3.

By this time we have sufficiently proved from Scripture, that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are the same in name, in Office, in Edifying the Church in power Ordination and Jurisdiction: we sum up all that hath been spoken in one argument:

They have the *same Name*, the *same Ordination* to their Office, the *same qualification* for *their Office*, the *same work* to feed the *flock* of God, to *ordain Pastors* and *Elders* to *Rule* and *Govern*; they are one and the same Office: but such as are *Bishops* and *Prebyters*: *Ergo.*

SECT. VI.

Pag. 20. But the dint of all this *Scripture*, the *Remonstrant* would elude, by obtruding upon his Reader *a Commentary* (as he calls it) of *the*

the Apoſtles now practiſe (which he would force to contradict their own rules) to which he *ſuperadds the unqueſtionable gloſs of the clear practiſe of their immediate ſucceſſors in this adminiſtration*: For the Apoſtles practiſe we have already diſcovered it, from the Apoſtles own writings; and for his gloſs, he ſuperadds, if it corrupts not the Text, we ſhall admit it; but if it do, we muſt anſwer with *Tertullian*, *Id verum quodcunque primum; id adulterum quod poſterius*, whatſoever is firſt is true, but that which is latter is adulterous. Tertullian.

In the examination of this Gloſs, to avoid needleſs Controverſie, firſt, we take for granted on both ſides, that the firſt and beſt Antiquity, uſed the names of *Biſhops* and *Presbyters* promiſcuouſly. Secondly, that in proceſs of time, ſome one was honoured with the name of *Biſhop*, and the reſt were called *Presbyters* or *Cleri*. Thirdly, that it was not *Nomen inane*, but there was ſome kind of Imparity between him and the reſt of the Presbyters.

Yet in this we differ, that they ſay, this *Impropriation* of name, and *Imparity of place, is of divine Right and Apoſtolical Inſtitution*; we affirm both to be occaſional and of humane invention; and undertake to ſhew out of antiquity, both the *occaſion upon which*, and the *perſons by whom this imparity* was both brought into the Church.

On our parts ſtands *Jerom* and *Ambroſe*, and others, whom we doubt not but our Remonſtrant will grant a place among his Gloſſators: St. *Jerom* tell us in 1 *Tit.*

Idem ergo eſt Presbyter qui Epiſcopus, & antequam Diaboli inſtinctu, ſtudia in Religione fierent, & diceretur in populis, ego ſum Pauli, *ego* Apol. *ego* Cephæ, *communi Presbyterorum Conſilio eccleſiæ gubernabantur. Poſtquam vero unuſquiſque eos quos baptizaverat ſuos putabat eſſe, non Chriſti; in toto orbe decretum eſt, ut unus de Preſbyteris electus ſuperponeretur cæteris, ad quem omnis Eccleſiæ Cura pertineret, & ſchiſmatum ſemina tollerentur. Putat aliquis non Scripturarum, ſed noſtram eſſe ſententiam, Epiſcopum & Presbyterum unum eſſe, & aliud ætatis, aliud*

A Presbyter and a Biſhop is the ſame, & before there were through the Divils inſtinct, diviſions in religiō, & the people began to ſay *I am* of *Paul*, & I of *Apollo*, & I of *Cephas*, the Churches were governedby the Cōmon-councel of the Presbyters. But after that each man began to account thoſe whō he had baptized his own & not Chriſts, it was decreed through the whole world, that one of the Prebyters ſhould be ſet over the reſt, to whom the care of all the Church doth belong, that the ſeeds of ſchiſm might be taken away. Thinks any, that this is my opinion, & not the opinion of the Scripture, that a Biſhop & an Elder is the ſame? let him read the words

of

esse nomen officii, relegat Apostoli ad Philippenses *verba, dicentis,* Paulus & Timotheus *servi Jesu Christi qui sunt* Philippis, *cum Episcopis & Diaconis, &c.* Philippi *una est urbs* Macedoniæ, *& certe in una Civitate non poterat plures esse (ut nuncupantur) Episcopi &c sicut ergo Presbyteri sciant ex Ecclesiæ consuetudine ei qui sibi præpositus fuerit esse subjectos; Ita Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis Dominicæ veritate Presbyteris esse majores, & in communi debere Ecclesiam regere.*

of the Apostle to the *Philippians* saying, *Paul* & *Timothy*, the servants of Jesus Christ, to them that are at *Philippi*, with the Bishops & Deacons. *Philippi* is one City of *Macedonia*, & certainly in one city there could not be many *Bishops* (as they are now called, *&c.*) and after the allegations of many other Scriptures, he concludes thus, as the Elders therefore may know, that they are subject to him that is over them by the custom of the Church; so let the Bishops know, that it is more from custom, than from any true dispensation from the Lord, that they are above the presbyters, and that they ought to rule the Church in common.

In which words of *Jerom*, these five things present themselves to the Readers view.

First, That *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, are originally the same; *Idem ergo est Prebyter qui Episcopus.*

Secondly, That that imparity that was in the time between Bishops and Elders, was grounded upon Ecclesiastical custom, and not upon divine institution; *Episcopi noverint*, &c.

Thirdly, That this was not his private judgement, but the judgement of Scripture; *Putat aliquis*, &c.

Fourthly, That before this priority was upon this occasion started, the Church was governed *Communi Presbyterorum consilio*, by the Counsel of the Presbyters in common, and that even after this imparity, it ought to be so governed; *Sciant Episcopi se Ecclesiam debere in communi regere.*

Fifthly, That the occasion of this Imparity and Superiority of Bishops above Elders, was the divisions, which through the Devils instinct fell among the Churches; *Postquam vero Diaboli instinctu.*

Saravia would take advantage of this place, to deduce this Imparity as high as from the Apostles times; because even then they began to say, *I am of* Paul, *and I of* Apollos: but St. *Jerom* was not so weak as this man would make him, to speak Inconsistencies: and when *he propounds* it to himself, to prove that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are in Sripture the same, to let fall words that should confute his own proposition; whereas therefore St. *Jerome* saith, that

after

after men began to ſay, I am of Paul, *and I of* Apollos, &c. *it was decreed, that one of the Presbyters ſhould be ſet over the reſt*, &c. This is ſpoken indeed in the *Apoſtles phraſe*, but *not of the Apoſtles times*, elſe to what purpoſe is the coacervation of Texts that follows?

But ſuppoſe it ſhould be granted to be of Apoſtolicall antiquity (which yet we grant not, having proved the contrary) yet it appears, it was not of *Apoſtolical Intention*, but of *Diabolical occaſion*: And though the Devil by kindling Diviſions in the Church, did miniſter *Occaſion* to the invention of the primacy or prelacy, or one for the ſuppreſſing of Schiſm; yet there is juſt cauſe to think, that the Spirit of God in his Apoſtles, was never the Authour of this invention

Firſt, becauſe we read in the Apoſtles dayes there were diviſions, *Rom.* 16.7. and Schiſms, 1 *Cor.* 3.3. and 11.18. yet the Apoſtle was not directed by the Holy Ghoſt to ordain Biſhops for the taking away of thoſe Diviſions. Neither in the rules he preſcribes for the healing of thoſe breaches, doth he mention Biſhops for that end: Nor in the Directions given to *Timothy* and *Titus* for the *Ordination of Biſhops or Elders*, doth he mention this as one end of their *Ordination*, or *one peculiar duty of their Office*. And though *the* Apoſtle ſaith, *Oportet hæreſes inter vos eſſe, ut qui probati ſunt manifeſti fiant inter vos*; yet the Apoſtle no where ſaith, *Oportet Epiſcopos eſſe ut tollantur hæreſes, quæ manifeſte fiunt.*

Secondly, becauſe as Doctor *Whitaker* ſaith, the remedy deviſed hath proved worſe than the diſeaſe, which doth never happen to that remedy whereof the Holy Ghoſt is the Authour.

Thirdly, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt, who could perceive what would enſue thereupon, would never ordain that for a remedy, which would not only be ineffectual to the cutting off of evil, but become a Stirrop for Antichriſt to get into his ſaddle. For if there be a neceſſity of ſetting up one *Biſhop* over many *Presbyters* for preventing Schiſms, there is as great a neceſſity of ſetting up one *Arch-Biſhop over many Biſhops*, and one *Patriarch over many Arch-Biſhops*, and one *Pope over all*, unleſs men will imagine, that there is a danger of Schiſm only among *Presbyters*, and not among *Biſhops and Arch-Biſhops*, which is contrary to *Reaſon*, *Truth*, *Hiſtory*, and our own *Experience*.

And leſt our adverſaries ſhould appeal from *Hierome* as an incompetent Judge in this caſe, becauſe a Presbyter, and ſo a party, we will therefore ſubjoyn the judgements of other ancient Fathers who were themſelves Biſhops.

The Commentaries that go under the name of Saint *Ambroſe* upon *Epheſ.* 4. mention another occaſion of this Diſcrimination or

priority; and that was † the increase and dilatation of the Church, upon occasion whereof they did ordain Rectors or Governors, and other Officers in the Church; yet this he grants, that this did differ from the former Orders of the Church, and from apostolical Writ.

† *At ubi omnia Loca Circumplexa est Ecclesia, Conventicula constituta sunt: & cæperunt Rectores: & Cætera Officia in Ecclesiis sunt ordinata. Cœpit alio ordine & providentia gubernari Ecclesia. ideo non per omnia conveniunt Scripta Apostoli ordinationi quæ nunc in Eceleſia est, quia hæc inter ipsa primordia scripta sunt. Nam & Timotheum à se Presbyterum Creatum Episcopum vocat, &c. Sed quia cæperunt sequentes Presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus tenendos, immutata est ratio, &c.*

And this Rectorship or Priority was devolved at first from one Elder to another by Succession, when he who was in the place was removed, the next in order among the Elders succeeded. But this was afterwards changed, and that unworthy men might not be preferred, it was made a matter of Election, and not a matter of Succession. Thus much we find concerning the occasion of this imparity, enough to shew, it is not of Divine Authority.

For the second thing, the persons who brought in this Imparity: the same Authors tell us, the Presbyters themselves brought it in; witness *Hierom ad Evag. Alexandriæ Presbyterum unum ex se electum in Excelsiori gradu collacatum, Episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faceret, aut Diaconi de se Archidiaconum.* The Presbyters of *Alexandria* did call him their *Bishop* whom they had chosen among *themselves*, and placed in a higher degree; as if an army should make an Emperour, or the Deacons an Archdeacon.

Hierom ad Evag

Ambrose upon the fourth of the *Ephesians* tells us, it was done by *Counsel*, and although he never name the time nor place of the *Counsel*, yet ascribing it to a *Councel* he grants it not to be Apostolical: this gave occasion to others to fix it upon Custom as *Hierom*, in *Tit.* and *Aug. Epist.* 10. *secundum honorum vocabula quæ Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, Episcopatus Presbyterio major est*, and had that πρεσβεία, or Prelacy had the Seal and confirmation of *Divine* or *Apostolical Authority*, *Gregory Nazianzen* would never in such a pathetick manner have wished the abolition of it, as he doth in his 29. Oration.

Ambros. ubi prius.

Greg. Naz. Orat. 28

And now *where is that acknowledgment, and conveiance of Imparity and Jurisdiction which* saith this Remonstrant *was derived from the Apostles hands, and deduced in an uninterrupted line, unto this day: where is it?* we find no such *Imparity delivered from Apostolicall hands*, nor *acknowledged* in Apostolical writings; yet had there *been such acknowledgement and conveiance of imparity*: how this should have been deduced to us in an uninterrupted Line we know not, unless our *Bishops* will draw the Line of *their* Pedigree through the *loyns of Antichrist*, and *joyn issue*, and *mingle blood with Rome*: which

Pag. 21, 22.

it

it seemes they will rather do then lose this plea for their τυραννικὴ προνομία *their tyrannicall prerogative*, as *Nazianzen* calls it. *Greg. Nazi. ubi prius.*

Suffer us therefore humbly to appeal to your Honours, whether this Remonstrant hath not given sentence against himself, who is so confident of the Evidence of his cause, that he doth not fear to say, if there can be no better *Evidence under Heaven for any matter offact then there is for* his Episcopacy: Let EPISCOPACY BE FOR EVER ABANDONED OUT OF THE CHURCH OF GOD. Pag 22.

SECT. VII.

YEt it seemes himself in the height of his confidence was not without Jealousies, of some thing might be spoken against his cause, therefore he seemes to hear, what is spoken against it.

That the Apostles Bishops and ours are two: there was no other then a Parochial Pastor, a Preaching Presbyter without inequality, without any rule over his brethren. Ours claim an eminent Superiority, and a power of Ordination and Jurisdiction unknown to the primitive times Pag. 23.

That this which he supposeth he hears us say is Scripture-Truth we have shewed already, &c. that there *was parity between Presbyters and Bishops: and that eminent superiority and power of Ordination and Jurisdiction which our Bishops claim*, was unknown to Scripture: and are now prepared by *Gods assistance* to prove, it was unknown to primitive times.

But how doth this Remonstrant meet with this reply: ALAS, ALAS HOW GOOD PEOPLE may be abused by misinformatiō! Pag. 24. It seemes the man judged this Reply so poor as in his thoughts it was more worthy of his *pitty*, then of *his paines* to answer, or rather knew there was more in this Reply, then he knew how to answer, and therefore waves it with his *Rhetorick*.

And this we rather think, because he knows but little in *Antiquity*, that knows not, that there is so vast a difference between our Bishops, and those that were not only in the *A*postles dayes (whom we have proved to be undistinguished from Presbyters) But those Bishops that were in the Church 400. years after, when there began to be some discrimination; that *Episcopacy* may well be likened to the Ship *Argo*, that was so often repaired, as there was nothing left of the *First Materials*; yet still it challenged *the first Name*.

Which difference we spread before your Honours in three particulars: first in point of Election to their office; secondly, in point of Execution of their office; thirdly in point of State-Imployment.

First (having discovered already upon what *occasion* this priority began to have existence in the Church, and from whom it first

received its being, not from *God* but from *Conſent and cuſtome* of the *Churches*, according to *Ambroſe*, *Jerome*, *Auguſtine*, &c.) We come now to declare what was the manner of Election unto this Priority in theſe times, and to ſhew firſt, how therein theſe Biſhops did differ from ours; for all their Elections were ordered by the privity, conſent and approbation of the *people*, where the *Biſhops* was to ſerve. Were there no other Authors to make this good, *Cyprian* alone would do it; among other places let his 68. Epiſtle witneſs, where he ſaith, * *Plebs maxime habet poteſtatem*, &c. The people ſpecially have power either of chuſing worthy Prieſts, or rejecting the unworthy: for this is derived from *Divine Authority*, that the prieſts ſhould be choſen in the preſence of the people, before all their eyes, and approved as fit and worthy by their publick vote and teſtimony. This he proves by the Teſtimony of Sacred Writ both Old and New. Where we obſerve firſt, that the ſpeciall power of judging of the worthines or unworthines of a man for the Prelacy, was in the breaſt of the people. Secondly, the ſpecial power of chooſing or rejecting of his place according as they judged him worthy or unworthy reſided in the people. *Plebs maxime habet poteſtatem*, &c. Thirdly, that this power did deſcend upon the people *De divina authoritate*.

* *Plebs ipſa maximè habet poteſtatem vel Eligendi Dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recuſandi, quod & ipſum videmus de divina Authoritate deſcendere: ut ſacerdos plebe præſente ſubomnium oculis diligatur, & dignus atque Idoneus publico judicio ac teſtimonio comprobetur.* By Prieſts the Author here underſtands Biſhop, as the whole *Series* of the Epiſtle ſhews.

Nor was this the judgement of one ſole man, but of an *African* Synod conſulted by the Spaniſh Churches in poynt of Election, as the Inſcription of the Epiſtle ſhews.

(a) Κατὰ δὲ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς χειροτονίας καὶ κατὰ τὸ τοῦ Παύλου ῥῆμα, —πάντα καὶ νομικῶς ἐξετασθῆναί τε καὶ προχωρῆσαι, παρόντων τῶν αἰτουμένων λαῶν καὶ κλήρικῶν —— τοῦτο δὲ τὰς μὲν ἐκκλησιαστικὰς, χαίρουσι φρεναλύσαι, τὰς δὲ εὐθὺ ἡ βλασφημεῖν ἀναγκάζει

Athanaſ. Epiſt. ad Orthodoxos.

(a) The obtruſion of a Biſhop upon the Church of *Alexandria* without the preſence, deſire and vote of the Clergy or People is condemned by *Athanaſius*, not only as a breach of Canon, but as a Tranſgreſſion of Apoſtolical preſcript, and that it did compell or neceſſitate the Heathen to blaſpheme.

Nor did only *Chriſtian Biſhops*, but *Chriſtian Princes* acknowledge the Right and Power of Election of Biſhops to be in the people, ſo that *admired Conſtantine*, the great Promover and Patron of the peace of the Chriſtian Church, writing to the Church of *Nicomedia* againſt *Euſebius* and *Theognius*, tells them the ready way to lay a ſleep the tumults that did then diſturb the Church about the Election of a Biſhop, was, *Si modo Epiſcopum fidelem & integrum nacti fuerint, quod quidem in præſentia in veſtra ſitum eſt poteſtate, quodque etiam dudum penès veſtrum judicium fuerat, niſi* Euſebius *de quo dixi, pravo coram, qui eum juverunt conſilio, hac præceps ruiſſet & rectum Eligendi Ordinem impudenter conturbaſſet, Gell in Act Con. Nic part.* 3. if they would get a faithful and upright Biſhop, which, ſaith he, is in your *power preſently to do*; and was long ago, if *Euſebius* with the aid of his Faction, had not ruſhed in upon, and im-

impudently disturbed the right *Order of Election.*

That which this sacred Emperor calls the *right Order of Election*, what is it but the Election by the people? in whose power, he saith, it then was, and long had been to choose a *Bishop*; and by whose power the next *Bishop* was chosen. So the same Authour tells us, that after *Eusebius* and *Theognius* were cast out of their severall seats for *Arianism*, by the Councel of *Nice*, others were appointed in their rooms by the *Clergy and people* of each Dioceſs. *Idem ubi supra.*

To this Election in *Nicomedia*, we could (if it were needfull in so clear a truth) add many in like presidents of popular Election; which for brevities sake we pass over. Not questioning, but that which hath been spoken, is sufficient to inform the intelligent Reader, that our Bishops, and the Bishops of former times, are TWO *in poynt of Election* *Cyprian, Cornelius, Athanasius* and others.

SECT VIII.

A Second thing wherein we have undertaken to *shew*, that our *Bishops*, and the *Bishops* of former times are TWO, is in the Execution of their office; and here there are three things, wherein he that will not *wilfully shut his eyes against all light*, may see a latitude of difference between ours and former Bishops. First, in that *Sole jurisdiction* which our Bishops assume to themselves. Secondly, in the *Delegation* they make of the *power of exercising* this Jurisdiction unto others. Thirdly, in the *way of Exercise to that power.*

For the first of these, *Their Sole Jurisdiction*; That our *Bishops* assume unto themselves, it is *known* and that this sole *Sole Jurisdiction* was a *stranger*, a *Monster* to former times, we shall now prove, and make clear; that the power of *Ordination, Admonition, Excommunication, Absolution*, was not in the hands of any sole man.

First, For *Ordination*, *Cyprian* in his exile writing to his Charge, certifies them, that *Aurelius was ordained by him and his Colleagues who were present with him*; (who were these Colleagues, but his Presbyters, as himself expounds it; writing to *Lucius* in his own name, and the name of his Clergy and people, *Ego & Collegæ, & Fraternitas omnis*, &c. I and my Colleagues, and my whole people send these letters to you, *&c.* So that this is clear in *Cyprian*'s time, *Presbyters* had a hand in *Ordination*, & *Bishops* did not ordain alone. *Firmilianus* saith of them that rule in the Church, *Quod baptizandi, MANUM IMPONENDI ET ORDINANDI possident potestatem.* And who those be, he expresseth a little before, *SENIORES & Præpositi*; by whom the *Presbyters* as well as the *Bishops* are understood. *Cyp. Epist. 33.* *Epist 78.* *Apud Cyp. Ep. 78*

And

And as theſe places prove, that Biſhops in the primitive time could not ordain alone without the Prebyters; ſo there are that give us light to underſtand, that the Presbyters might ordain without the Biſhops. The Author of the Comment upon the *Epheſians*, that goes under the name of *Ambroſe*, ſaith, *Apud Egyptum Preſbyteri conſignant, ſi præſens non ſit Epiſcopus*, *In Egypt the Presbyters ordain, if Biſhops be not preſent*; ſo ſaith *Auguſtine* in the ſame; and the Corepiſcopus * who was but a Prebyter, had power to impoſe hands, and to ordain within his precincts, with the Biſhops Licence. Now Licences conſer not a power to him that hath it not, but only a faculty to exerciſe that power he hath.

Cum jure Divino non ſint diverſi gradus Epiſcopi & Paſtoris: Manifeſtum eſt ordinationem in ſuâ Eccleſiâ factam JURE DIVINO RATA Meſſe.

The iniquity of our times hath been ſuch, that a Miniſter may not preach to his own flock, without a Licence: doth this licence make a man a Miniſter, and give him power to preach or only a faculty & liberty to exerciſe that power? Should a Biſhop give a Laike a Licence to preach, or to ordain, doth that Licence make him a Miniſter, or a Biſhop? Sure all will ſay no: why? becauſe in the Laike there is not *Actus primus*, the root & principle of that power, which Licence only opens a way to the exerciſe of; and therefore that muſt be concluded to be in thoſe Chorepiſcopi, or Presbyters, by vertue of their place and calling, and not by vertue of a Licence. So that the power of *Ordination* was ſo far from reſiding in the Biſhop alone, as that the Presbyters and Chorepiſcopi had power to ordain as well as he.

Itaq; cum Epiſcopi ordinarii fiant hoſtes Eccleſiæ, aut nolunt ordinationem impertire, Eccleſia retinet jus ſuum. Melanch. ubi ſupra, pag. Concil. Antioc. Can. 10. & Ancyr. Can. 13.

Neither was this only a matter of *Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtom*, but of *Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution*, which bids the Biſhop;

Concil. 4. Carth. Can. 22.

First, in all his Ordinations to conſult with his Clergy; *Ut Epiſcopus ſine Concilio Cleri ſui & ſuorum Clericos non ordinet*: *That the Biſhop ſhall not ordain a Clergy man without the councel of the Clergy*, this was *Cyprians* practiſe, *Ep.* 33.

2.

Ibid. Can. 8.

Secondly, in his Ordinations to take the concurrent aſſiſtance of his Presbyters; *Cum ordinatur Presbyter, Epiſcopo eum benedicente, & manum ſuper caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri qui præſentes ſunt, manus ſuas juxta manum Epiſcopi ſuper caput illius teneant.* When a Presbyter is ordained, the Biſhop bleſſing him, & holding his hand upon his Head, all the Presbyters that are preſent, ſhall likewiſe lay their hands vpon his Head, with the hands of the Biſhop. In which Canon, we have the unanimous vote of two hundred and fourteen Biſhops, declaring that the power of *Ordination* is in the hands of Presbyters as well as Biſhops.

Hieronym. in Epiſt. ad Evag. Chryſoſt. Hom. 11. in 1. ad. Tim.

And whereas it may be objected, that *Hierom* and *Chryſoſtome*, affirming the Biſhops to differ from Presbyters in the power of Ordination

nation, seem to imply, that the power is soly theirs: Here we desire it may be observed.

First, that these Fathers put all the difference that lies between Bishops and Presbyters, to be in poynt of Ordination. *Quid facit Episcopus quod non facit Presbyter excepta Ordinatione.* And therefore *Chrysostome* himself confesseth, that in his dayes there was little or no difference between a Bishop and a Prebyter. *Inter Episcopum & Presbyterum interest ferme nihil, &c.* *Chrysost.* upon the 1 *Tim.*

Secondly, that this difference is not so to be understood, as if these Fathers did hold it to be by divine right (as *Bellarmin* and our Episcopal men would make us believe) but by a humane constitution. And therefore they do not speak *De jure* but *de facto*, *Quid facit, &c.* not *quid debet facere.* And this *Hierom* confesseth. So *Leo* *Libro de sept. Ordinibus.* *prim ep.*88. upon complaints of unlawful Ordinations, writing to the Germane and French Bishops, reckons up what things are reserved to the Bishops, among which he sets down *Presbyterorum & Diaconorum consecratio*, and then adds, *Quæ omnia solis deberi summis Pontificibus Authoritate Canonum præcipitur*: So that for this power of Ordination, they are more beholden to the Canon of the Church, then to the Canon of Gods Word. *Concil Aquisgra 1. Can 18. Solum propter authoritatem Clericorum ordinatio & consecratio reservata est summo Sacerdoti.*

Thirdly, we answer this very humane difference was not in the Primitive Antiquity. It was not so in *Cyprians* time, as we even now shewed. And when it did prevail, it was but a particular custome (and sometimes usurpation) of some Churches. For it was otherwise appointed in the Councel of Carthage, and in Egypt, and other places, as is declared in the former part of this Section; and even in *Chrysostomes* time, it was so little approved of, that it was one great accusation against *Chrysostome* himself, *That he made Ordinations without the Presbytery, and without the consent of his Clergy*, this is quoted by Bishop *Downam, lib.* 1. *cap.*8. *page* 176.

SECT. IX.

Pilson Spalat. Franc. a Sancta Clara.

NOr had the Bishops of former times more right to the power of *sole Jurisdiction*, then of *sole Ordination*: And here we have *Confitentem reum*, our very adversaries confesse the votes of Antiquity are with us. *Cyp. Epist* 6. & 28. 18. *Concil.* 4. *Carth. Can.*23. *Vid. Ruff. Hist. lib.* 10. *cap.* 9. *Sozo. l.*2. *c.*23. *Possidon. de vita Aug. c.*4. *Orig. Hom.*11. *in Exo. pag.* 97.

Cyprian professeth, that *he would do nothing without the Clergy*; nay, *he could do nothing without them*; nay, *he durst not take upon him alone* to determine that which of right did belong to all; & had he or any other done so, the fourth Counsel of Carthage condemns the Sentence of the Bishop, as *Irrita, nisi Clericorum sententia confirmetur.*

Would ye know the particulars, wherein the Bishops had no power of Judicature without their Presbyters? First

1. *Decret. part. 2. Can. 15 quæst. 7. Per totum & pa tes Dist. 93. cap. 5. 9.*

First, in judging and censuring Presbyters themselves, and their Doctrine; For this the Canon Law in *Gratian* is full and clear; *Episcopus non potest judicare Prebyterum vel Diaconum sine Synodo & Senioribus:* Thus *Basil* counselled and practised, *Epist. l. 75.* So *Amb. l. 10. Cyril in epist. ad Johannem Antiochen.* Thus *Gregory ad Johan. Panormitan. Lib. 11. Epist. 49.*

2. *Clem. Alex. Stromat. lib. 7.*

Secondly, in judging of the converfion or crimes of any of the members of the Church: *Penès Presbyteros est Disciplina quæ facit homines meliores*; That Discipline that works *emendation* in men, is in the power of the *Elders*. And therefore when any was questioned in point of conversation, he was brought, saith *Tertullian* into the *Congregation* where were *Exhortations, Castigations*, and *Divine censures*: And who had the chief stroke in in these censures, he tells us after: *Præsident probati quique seniores*: *All the approved Elders sit as Presidents.*

Tertul. Apol. adverf. Gent.

And those censures that passed by the whole Presbytery were more approved by the *Church* in ancient times, then such as were passed by one man; for we find that when *Syagrius* and *Ambrose* passed Sentence in the same case, the *Church* was unsatisfied in the Sentence of *Syagrius*, because he past it *sine alicujus fratris Consilio*, without the counsel or consent of any of his *Brethren*. But were pacified with the sentence of Saint *Ambrose*: because, saith he, *Hoc Judicium Nostrum cum Fratribus & Consacerdotibus participatum processerit.*

Ambrof. Epist. ad Syagrium.

Nor was there any kind of censures that the Bishops did administer alone: Admonitions were given by *Elders*; *Augustine* tells us the Elders did admonish such as were offenders, to the same purpose speaks *Origen contra Celsum. Lib. 3.*

Aug de verb. Apost. Ser. 10.

† So excommunication, though that being the dreadfullest thunder of the Church, and as *Tertullian* calls it, *summum præjudicium futuri judicij*, the great fore-runner of the Judgement of God, was never vibrated but by the hands of those that laboured in the Word and Doctrine: yet was no one man in the Church invested with this power more then another.

† *Constat Jurisdictionem illam excommunicandi reos manifestorum criminum pertinere ad omnes Patres, hanc ad se solos tyrannice transtulerunt, & ad quæ tum contulerunt Episcopi, Melanc. ubi sup.*

Therefore saith *b Hierom*; *Presbytero, si peccavero, licet me tradere satanæ in interitum carnis.* If I sin, a Presbyter (not a Bishop only) may deliver me to Satan to the destruction, &c. where the Reader may please to take notice that Saint *Hierom* speaks not of one particular Presbyter, but of the Order of *Presbyters.*

b *Hierom. Epist. ad Heliodor. Ep ad Demetr.*

The same S. *Hierom* saith again, *Sunt quos Ecclesia reprehendit, quos interdum abjicit, in quos nonnunquam Episcoporum & Clericorum censura desævit.* There be some whom the Church reproves, and some which she casts out; against whom the censures of *Bishops and Presbyters* sharpy proceed; where we see, the Censures whereby wicked

wicked men were cast out of the Church, were not in the sole hands of the Bishops, but likewise in the hands of Presbyters.

Syricus Bishop of *Rome* signifies to the Church of *Millain*, that *Jovinianus*, *Auxentius*, &c. were cast out of the Church for ever, and he sets down how they did it, *Omnium Nostrum tam Presbyterorum quam Diaconorum, quam totius etiam Cleri scisitata fuit sententia.* There was a concurrence of all Presbyters, Deacons, and the whole Clergy in that sentence of Excommunication. *Ambros. lib. 10. Epist. 80.*

The truth herein may be further evidenced by this, because the whole Clergy as well as the Bishops imposed hands upon such as repenting were absolved: *Nec ad Communicationem* (saith *Cyprian*) *venire quis possit, nisi prius ab Episcopo & Clero Manus illi fuerit imposita: No man that hath been excommunicated might return to Church-Communion, before hands had been laid upon him by the Bishop and Clergy.* *Cypr. Epist. 12.* And this was the custom saith *Cyprian* *in moribus delictis.*

Also writing to his Clergy concerning lapsed Christians, he tells them, *Exomologesi facta & Manu eis à vobis in pœnitentiam impositâ, &c.* that after confession and the *laying on their hands*, they might be commended unto God: so when certain returning from their heresie were to be received into the Church at *Rome* in the time of *Cornelius*, they came before the *Presbytery*, and therefore confessed their sins, and so were admitted. *Cypr. Epist. 46. vide etiam Cyp. Epist. 6.*

But though the sentence of Excommunication was managed only by the hand of those that laboured in the Word and Doctrine, yet we will not conceal from you, that neither Excommunication, nor absolution did pass without the *knowledge and approbation* of the body of the Church, to which the Delinquent did belong.

So we have learned out of *Tertullian*, that their censures were ordered in their publick assemblies; and good reason, because the people were to forbear communion with such, 2 *Thes.* 3. 6, 14, 15. and publick censures of the Church were inflicted, not only from the Emendation of Delinquents, but for the admonition of others, and therefore ought to be administred in publick, that others might fear, 1 *Tim.* 5. 20. *Origen* speaking of the Duty and Power of the Church in cutting off a scandalous Person, though a Presbyter, making the case his own, he saith thus: *In uno consensu Ecclesia universa conspirans excidat me dextrâ suam & projiciat a se, He would have the consent of the whole Church in that Act.* *Tertul. Apol. adver. Gent. cap. 39.* *Origen. Hom. 7. in Josh.*

And when the lapsed Christians were received again to the Church, the Peoples consent was therein; else why should *Cyprian* say, *Vix plebi persuadeo, imò extorqueo ut tales patiantur admitti:* I can scarce perswade the people to suffer such to be admitted: and in another Epistle written to his people in his Banishment, he promiseth to examine all things, they being present and judging. *Examinabuntur singula præsentibus & judicantibus vobis.* *Cypr. Epist. 55.* *Cypr. Epist. 11. ad plebem.*

But of this power of the People we shall have a further occasion to

ſpeak afterwerds, when we come to diſcourſe of *Governing Elders*.

Only may it pleaſe your Honours from hence to take notice, how unjuſtly our Biſhops have invaded this right and power of Presbyters and people in Church cenſures, and diveſting both of it, have girt it wholly upon themſelves, and how herein they and the Biſhops of former times are TWO.

SECT. X.

AND as our Biſhops, and the Biſhops of former times are TWO in point of *Sole Juriſdiction*, ſo alſo in the *Delegation* of this power of *Juriſdiction* unto others, to their Chancellours, Commiſſaries, Officers, *&c.* Was ever ſuch a thing as this heard of in the beſt primitive Times? that *men, that never received Impoſition of hands*, ſhould not only be received into aſſiſtance, but be *wholly intruſted with the power of Spiritual Juriſdiction*: Even then when it is to be exerciſed over *ſuch perſons as have had hands laid upon them.*

* *Indecorum eſt Laicum vicarium eſſe Epiſcopi, & ſeculares in Eccleſiâ judicare: in uno enim eodemque opere non decet diſpar profeſſio quod etiam in lege Divina prohibetur dicente Moſe, non arabis in bove & aſino ſimul*, Concil. Hiſpal. 2 Cypr. Epiſt 28.

We may obſerve in *Cyprian*, whilſt perſecution ſeparated him from his Church, when queſtions did ariſe among his people, he doth not ſend them to his Chancellour or Comiſſary; No, he was ſo far from ſubſtituting any man (much leſs a *lay man*) to determine or give Judgment in ſuch caſes, that he would not aſſume that power wholly to himſelf, but ſuſpends his Judgement, till the hand of God ſhould reſtore him to his Church again, that with the Advice and Councel of the Presbyters, he might give ſentence, as may appear to any that ſhall peruſe his Epiſtles.

Sure If God had ever led his Church to ſuch a way of deputation, it would have been in ſuch a caſe of Neceſſity as this was, or had any footſteps of any ſuch a courſe as this been viſible by this holy Martyr in the goings of former ages, he needed not to have deferred the determination of the queſtion about the receiving of ſome penitent lapſed ones into the boſom of the Church again, till his return and the return of his Clergy, as he doth.

We will inſtance in his 28 Epiſtle, wherein giving direcſiō for the excōmunicating of ſuch as would raſhly cōmunicate with lapſed Chriſtians, he gives this charge not to his *Chancellour or Comiſſary*, or any other man upon whom he had devolved his power, and ſet him as his *Deputy or Vicar general* in his abſence, but *ad Clerum*, to the whole Presbytery.

Downham in the defence of his Sermon, *lib.* 1. *Cap.*

This Truth is ſo clear, that Biſhop *Downam* the great Advocate of Epiſcopacy confeſſeth, that in *Ambroſe* his time, and a good while after (which was about 400. years) till the Presbyters were in a manner wholly neglected, the Biſhops had no *Ordinaries*, *Vicars*, *Chancelours*, or *Commiſſaries*, that were not *Clergy-men*: but this is but a *blind*, wherewith the Biſhop would Dorre his Reader, for we challenge any man to produce the names of any *Clergy-man* that was Vicar to *Ambroſe*, or Chancellor to *Auguſtine*, or any other of the Biſhops of thoſe times; ſo that herein our Biſhops and theirs are TWO.

SECT.

SECT. XI.

A Third branch wherein the difference between our Bishops, and the Bishops of former times, in poynt of Exercising their Jurisdiction, is visible, is the *way* or *manner* of exercising that power.

For brevities sake we will only instance in their proceedings in causes criminal; where let them tell us, whether any good *Antiquity* can yield them one Precedent for THEIR OATH EX OFFICIO, which hath been to their COURTS, as *Purgatory-fire to the Popes Kitchin*: they have forgotten that old Maxim in the Civil Law, *Nemo tenetur prodere seipsum*, which as it is grounded upon natural equity, so it is confirmed by *Diocletian* and *Maximilian*, *Nimis grave est quod petitis, &c. It is too grievous that the adverse part should be required to the exhibition of such things as should create trouble to themselves. Understand therefore what you ought to bring proofes for your intentions, and not to extort them from your adversaries against themselves.* *Cod. l. li. 4. Tit. 20. l. 7.*

Shall the Lamp of Nature in the night of Ethnicism enable Heathen Princes, (yea Persecutors) to see and enact thus much, and shall not the glorious Sun of the Gospel convince these of their Impieties in transgressing this Law, that call themselves *the Fathers of the Church?*

If neither the *light of Nature*, nor *Gospel-light* can, yet the custom of the Church, to which they so oft appeal, may both convince them of this iniquity, and discover to all the world the contrariety of their proceeding, to be the proceedings of former times, in this particular.

For *of Old*, both Plantiffe and Defendant were brought face to face before the parties, in whose power it was to judge: which way of proceeding, *Athanasius* affirmes to be according to Scripture, the Law of God. And because those that condemned *Macarius*, did not thus proceed, he condemns their Sentence as malicious and unjust. *Athanasius, Apol. 2.*

Of *Old*, no Sentence passed upon any man, but upon the Testimony of other witnesses besides the Accusers: after complaint Exhibited, the first things they applyed themselves to, was to consider the person and qnality of the *Accuser*, *Concil. prim. Constant. Can.* 6. Then they heard the *Witnesses*, who were two at least, *Can. Apost. Can.* 75 And these *Witnesses* must be such, as might not be imagined to be *partial*, nor to bear enmity nor malice against the party accused. *Ambrose Epist.* 64. so *Gratian*, *Caus.* 3. *qua.* 5 *cap. Quod suspecti.* *Apud Zonaram.*

Of *old*, None might be *party*, *witness*, and *Judge*, which *Gratian* proves at large. *Caus.* 4. *qua.* 4. *cap. Nullus unquam praesumat accusator simul esse, & Judex & testis.*

We grant indeed the *Canon Law* permits in some cases Tryal without *witnesses*; *Si crimen ita publicum est, ut meritò debeat appellari notorium*; If the crime be so publick, that it may deservedly, be called *Notorious*. Which Law further determines what is notorious, saying, *Offensam illam nos intelligimus manifestam, quae vel per confessionem vel probationem* *Greg. decret. lib. 3. Tit. 2. cap 8. quâ vos, Decret. Greg lib. 5 Tit. 4. cap. 24.*

bationem legitime nota fuerit, aut evidentia Rei, quæ nulla possit tergiversatione celari; We count that offence manifest, which either by confession, or by lawful proof comes to be known, or by evidence of fact, so as it can be hid by no tergiversations.

So that all was done in former times with mature deliberation, upon examination and evidence produced; and proved by such witnesses, as against whom the Defendant could lay no just exception. And not as now an Accusation whispered against a Man, he knows not by whom, to which he must take his Oath to answer, before he knows what his Accusation is. Which Oath, if he takes, without further witness, he is censured upon the witness of his own Oath If he takes it not, he is sent presently to prison, there to lye without Bayle or Main-prize, till the insupportable miseries of his long durance, compel him to take an Oath against Nature, Scripture, Conscience, and the just defence of his own innocency.

That our Bishops therefore and former Bishops are *Two*, in the point of executing their Judicatory power, we need spend no more time to prove. But come to the third thing, in which the difference between ours and former Bishops is to be evidenced.

SECT. XII.

Crysost. Hom. 40. in 2. Tim.

AND that is State-Imployment, or attendance upon Civil and Secular affairs, &c. which both Christ and Saint *Paul* prohibits, which prohibition teacheth every Bishop (to speak in *Chrysostom's* words) as well as *Timothy* to whom it is directed; *Nullus ergo Episcopatu præditus hæc audire detrectet, sed agere ea omnia detrectet*, Let no man that is a Bishop, refuse to hear what the Apostle saith, but to do what the Apostle forbids.

Recording this among those things that he did *Dolo modo ducere* κακοτεχνίας, *Sozo* 1. 9. *Nicep.* 18. 5.

We deny not but that Bishops were in the primitive times often incumbered with secular business: but these were put upon them, sometimes by Emperours, who sought the ruine of the Church, as *Julian*, of who *Nich. Lib.* 10. *Cap.* 13 doth report, that in *Clerum coaptatus Senatorum munere & ministerio perverse fungi jussit*. Sometimes the gracious disposition of Princes toward Christian Religion, made them thus to honour Bishops, thinking thereby to advance Religion, as *Constantine* the Great enacted, that such as were to be tryed before Civil Magistrates, might have leave to appeal *ad Judicium Episcoporum, atq; torũ sententiam ratam esse, tanquam ab ipso Imperatore prolatã*, And this the Historian reckoneth as one argument of his reverend respect to Religion. Sometimes the excellency of their singular parts cast civil dignities upon them, *Tiberius* granted a Questors *dignity unto a Bishop for his Eloquence*: *Chrysostom* for his notable stoutness and freedom of speech, was sent as the fittest man to *Gainas*, with the Emperours command. Sometimes the people observing the Bishops to be much honoured by the Emperour, would sollicit them to present their grievances

vances to the Emperour. And sometimes the aspiring humour of the Bishops raised them to such places, as appears by *Cyril*, who was the first Bishop in *Alexandria*, who had civil Dignities conferred upon him, as *Socrates* relates it, from whom civil authority did descend upon succeeding Bishops ἐξ ἐκείνου ἡ ἐπισκοπὴ Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ τὸ ἱερατικῆς τάξεως καταδυνάστευ εἰς τὴν πραγμάτων ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν, of whom *Nicephorus* therefore record- *Episcopatum majori cum fastu, prophanorum Magistratuum more, quã prædecessores ejus Episcopi, ingressus est, unde adeo initium sumptum est in Ecclesia Alexandrina, ut Episcopi etiam profana negotia curarent:* He entred upon his Episcopacy with more pomp then his predecessors, with a pomp conformable to the Heathen Magistrates. *Socra. 7 7.* *Lib. 14. c. 14.*

Both these Historians relate the sad consequence that followed upon this, that *Orestes* the *Roman Governour* seeing his power much weakened by the Bishops interposing in secular affairs, hated the Bishop: and this (as the Historian calls it) his *usurped power.* *Soc. l. 7. c. 19.*

This precedent of the Alexandrian Bishop, the Bishop of *Rome* did soon follow; *Et Romanus Episcopatus non aliter quam Alexandrinus, quasi EXTRA SACERDOTII FINES egressus ad secularem prinpatum erat jam delapsus*; The Bishop of *Rome* as well as the Bishop of *Alexandria* breaking the limits of the Priestly function, did degenerate into a secular Principallity: which purchased no less envy to him then that to the other. *Niceph.*

And though these two Bishops went at first abreast in this point, yet in a short time the Roman had out-stripped the Alexandrian in that power, till the Church degenerating more and more, that Roman Priest advanced his power, not only above all the Bishops, but all the Monarchs in the Christian Orb.

Yet notwithstanding, he that shall look into the Ancients shall find; first, that the best of them held, that they were not to be molested with the handling of worldly affairs, *Cyprian Epist.* 66. 1. *Singuli divino Sacerdotio honorati non nisi altari, & sacrificiis deservire & precibus atq; orationibus vacare debent, Molestiis secularibus non sunt obligandi, qui divinis rebus & spiritualibus occupantur.*

Secondly, that they complained of them as of heavy burthens, *Aug.* calls it *Angaria*, yea *Austin* himself in his 81. *Epistle* complains, that worldly business hindred his praying and so pressed him, that *vix respirare potuit*: and *Gregory* the great, *non sine dolore in secularibus versabatur, præfat. in Dial.* *Possidon in vita August.*

Thirdly, *Cyprian* construed it as one great cause of persecutions raised against the *Church*, *de lapsis*, Sect. 4.

Fourthly, it was much cryed down as unlawful by the holy Fathers, many Canons forbidding it, and that under pain of being removed from their place. *Can. Apost. Can.* 6. *Can.* 18. he that did presume to administer, Ῥωμαικὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἱερατικὴν διοίκησιν, a Roman com-

command or Administration of Military affaires or civil place (as *Zonaris* there) he should be deposed, *Can. Apo. Can.* 83. hiring of ground, medling with worldly affaires is to be laid aside by them. Otherwise they are threatned to be lyable to Ecclesiastical censures, *Conc. Cal. Con.* 3. *Conc. Carth. Can.* 16.

We will add this for a conclusion in this poynt, it is observed; by *Athanasius*, *Sulpitius*, *Severus*, and other Ecclesiasticall Historians, that the *Arians* were very expedite in worldly affairs, which experience they gained by their constant following & attendance upon the Emperours Court; and what trouble they occasioned to the Church thereby, is notoriously known to any that have seen the Histories of their time. And in this our Bishops have approved themselves more like to the *Arian* Bishops *than the purer Bishops of purer times*: but how ever clear it is, *that our Bishops and the Bishops of former times are Two: Two in election to their Office; Two in the discharge of their Office; Two in their Ordination, Juridiction, Processes, Censures, Administrations*; and the difference *between our Bishops and those of former times are greater, than between the great Bishops of Rome and them.*

SECT. XIII.

But it seems our Remonstrant soared above these times, even as high as the Apostles dayes, for he saith, *If our Bishops challenge any other spiritual power, than was by Apostolick Authority delegated to, and required of* Timothy *and* Titus, and the *Angels of the* seven *Asian Churches*, let them be *DISCLAIMED* as *USURPERS*. And the truth is, so they deserve to be, if they do but challenge the *same power* that the Apostle did delegate to *Timothy* and *Titus*; for *Timothy* and *Titus* were Evangelists, and so moved in a *Sphere* above Bishops or Presbyters. For *Timothy*, it is clear from the letter of the Text, 2 *Tim.* 4, 5. ἔργον ποίησον εὐαγγελιςτοῦ: *Do the work of an Evangelist*; if *Timothy* had been but a *Presbyter* or *Bishop*, *Paul* had here put him upon imployment *ultra Sphæram Activitatis.*

Let the Reader please to consult *Euseb. Hist. lib.* 3. *cap.* 33. according to some, after others *cap.* 37. 37. and view the description, he there makes of an Evangelist, & then judge of what we speak.

And to any man, that will but understand and consider what the Office of an **Evangelist was*; and wherein it differed from the Office of a *Presbyter* or *Bishop*, it will be manifest that *Timothy* and *Titus* were *Evangelists*, and no *Bishops*: for the title of *Evangelist* is taken but 2. ways, either for such as *wrote the Gospel*, and so we do not affirm *Timothy* and *Titus*, to be Evangelists, or else for such as *taught the Gospel*, and those were of two sorts, either such as had *ordinary places and ordinary gifts*, or such whose *place and gifts* were *extraordinary*; and such *Evangelists* were *Timothy* and *Titus*, and not *Bishops*, as will appear, if we consider, what was the *Difference*, between the *Evangelists* and *Bishops*. *Bishops* or *Peresbyters* were tyed to the peculiar care and tuition of that flock over which God hath made them *Overseers*, Act. 20. 28. But *Evangelists* wer not *tyed* to reside in *one particular place*, but did attend upon

upon the *Apoſtles*, by whoſe appointment they are ſent from place to place, as the neceſſity of the Churches did require. As appears firſt in *Timothy*, whom Saint *Paul* beſought to abide at *Epheſus*, 1 *Tim.* 1.3. which had been needleſs importunity, if *Timothy* had the *Epiſcopall* (that is the Paſtorall) charge of *Epheſus* committed to him by the Apoſtles, for then he might have laid as dreadful a charge upon him to abide at *Epheſus*, as he doth to preach the Goſpel. But ſo far was *Paul* from ſetling *Timothy in Cathedrâ* in *Epheſus*, that he rather continually ſends him up and down upon all Church-ſervices, for we find Act. 17. 14. that when *Paul* fled from the tumults of *Berea* to *Athens*, he left *Silas* and *Timothy* behind him, who afterwards comming to *Paul* to *Athens*, *Paul* ſends *Timothy* from *Athens* to *Theſſalonica* to confirm the *Theſſalonians* in the faith, as appears 1 *Theſſ.* 3.1,2. from whence returning to *Paul* to *Athens* again, the Apoſtle *Paul*, before he left *Athens* and went to *Corinth*, ſent him and *Silas* into *Macedonia*, who returned to him again to *Corinth*, Acts 18.5. afterward they travelled to *Epheſus*, from whence we read *Paul* ſent *Timothy* and *Eraſtus* into *Macedonia*, Acts 19.22. whither *Paul* went after them, and from whence they and divers other Brethren journied into *Aſia*, *Acts* 20.4. All which Brethren *Paul* calls, as it is probable, Ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, the Meſſengers of the Churches, 2 *Cor.* 8.23. and being thus accompanied with *Timothy*, and the reſt of the Brethren, he comes to *Miletum*, and calls the *Elders* of the Church of *Epheſus* thither to him, of which Church had *Timothy* been Biſhop, the Apoſtle inſtead of giving the Elders a charge to feed the flock of Chriſt, would have given that charge to *Timothy*, and not to them.

Anno. *Aera, Chriſti recepta*, 47. Anno 48. Anno 53. Anno 53.

And ſecondly, the *Apoſtle* would not ſo have forgotten himſelf, as to call the *Elders* Ἐπισκόπους before their Biſhops face.

Thirdly, It is to be conceived, the *Apoſtles* would have given them ſome directions, how to carry themſelves toward their Biſhop: but not a word of this, though *Timothy* were then in *Pauls* preſence, and in the preſence of the *Elders*. The clear evidence of which Text *demonſtrates*, that *Paul* did not leave *Timothy* at this time as *Biſhop* of *Epheſus*. But that it is rather *evident* that he took him along with him in his journey to *Hieruſalem*, and ſo to *Rome*; for we find that thoſe *Epiſtles* *Paul* wrote while he was a priſoner, bear either in their inſcription, or ſome other paſſage of them, the name of *Timothy* as *Pauls Companion, viz.* The Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, *Coloſſians*, *Hebrews*, *Philemon*, which Epiſtle he wrote in bonds, as the contexture, which thoſe two learned profeſſors, the one at *Heydelburge*, the other at *Saumur*, make of Saint *Pauls* Epiſtles, doth declare.

Pareus. Capellus. Heb. 13.23 We find not only that *TIMOTHY* was with *Paul* at *Rome*, but a priſoner with him there.

So that it appears that *Timothy* was no Biſhop, but a Miniſter, an Evangeliſt, a fellow-labourer of the *Apoſtles*, 1 *Theſ.* 3.1. an *Apoſtle*, a *Meſſenger* of the Church, 2 *Cor.* 8.23. a *Miniſter of God*, 1 *Theſ.* 3.2. theſe

titles

tirles the Holy Hhoſt gives him, but never the title of a *Biſhop*.

The like we find in Scripture concerning *Titus*, whom *Paul*, as it is conceived by learned men, did firſt aſſume into the fellowſhip of his labours in the place of *John*, and made him his companion in his journy through *Antioch* a to *Hieruſalem*, b ſo we find *Gal.* 2. 2. from thence returning to *Antioch* again; from thence he paſſeth through *Syria* and *Cilicia*, confirming the *Churches*; and from *Cilicia* he paſſeth to *Crete*, where having preached the Goſpel, and planted Churches, he left *Titus* c there *for a while to ſet in order things that remain.*

a Anno 43.
b Anno 45.
c Anno 46.

Yet it was *but for a while* he left him there, for in his Epiſtle which he wrote to him, not many years after, he enjoyns him to come to him to *Nicopolis* d where he did intend to winter, but changing that purpoſe ſends for him to *Epheſus*, where it ſeemes his Hyemal ſtation was, and from thence ſends him before him to *Corinth*, to enquire the ſtate of the *Corinthians* e. His return from thence *Paul* expects at *Troas* f, and becauſe coming thither he found not his *expectation* there, he was ſo grieved in his ſpirit, 2 *Cor.* 2. 12. that he paſſed preſently from thence into *Macedonia*, where *Titus* met him; and in the midſt of his afflictions joyed his ſpirits with the glad tydings of the powerful and gracious effects, his firſt Epiſtle had among the *Corinthians*, 2 *Cor.* 7. 5, 6, 7. *Paul* having there collected the Liberalities of the Saints, ſends *Titus* again to the *Corinthians*, to prepare them for the ſame ſervice of Miniſtring to the neceſſities of the Saints, 2 *Cor.* 8. 6. And makes him with ſome others the Conveiers of that ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*.

d Ann o 51.
e Anno 51.
f Anno 52.
g Anno 53.

All theſe journeyes to and fro did *Titus* make at the deſignment of the *Apoſtle*, even after he was left in *Crete*. Nor do we find, that after his firſt removal from *Crete* h; he did ever return thither. We read indeed, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. he was with *Paul* at *Rome*, and from thence returned not to *Crete*, but into *Dalmatia*. All which doth more then probably ſhew, it never was the *Intendment* of the *Apoſtle* to fix *Titus in Crete as a Biſhop*, but only to leave him there for a *ſeaſon*, for the good of *that Church*, and to call him from thence, and ſend him abroad to other Churches for their good, as their neceſſities might require. Now who that will acknowledge a *Diſtinction* between the *Offices of Biſhops and Evangeliſts*, and knowes wherein that *Diſtinction lies*, will not upon theſe premiſſes conclude that *Timothy and Titus were Evangeliſts and NOT Biſhiſhops.*

i Anno 64.

I, but ſome of the *Fathers* have called *Timothy and Titus* Biſhops. We grant it true; and it is as true that *ſome of the Fathers* hve called them *Archbiſhops* and *Patriarks*; yet doth it not follow, they were ſo. We add, ſecondly, that when the Fathers did call them ſo, it was not in a *proper*, but in an *improper* ſenſe; which we expreſs in the words of our *Learned Orthodox Raynolds*;

Raynolds contra Hart. Cap. 6.

You may learn by the Fathers themſelves, ſaith he, that when they tearmed

termed any Apoſtle a Biſhop of this or that City (as namely Sr. *Peter* of *Antioch* or *Rome*) they meant it in a general ſort and ſignification, becauſe they did attend that Church for a time, and ſupply that roome in preaching the Goſpel, which Biſhops did after; but as the name of Biſhop is commonly taken for the *Overſeer* of a particular Church, and Paſtor of a ſeveral flock; ſo *Peter* was not Biſhop of any other place; therefore not of *Rome*. And this is true by *Analogy* of all extraordinary Biſhops: and the ſame may be ſaid of *Timothy* and *Titus*, that he ſaith of *Peter*.

But were it true that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Biſhops: will this Remonſtrant undertake, that all his party ſhall ſtand to his conditions? *If our Biſhops challenge any other power then was by Apoſtolick Authority delegated, and required of* Timothy *and* Titus, *and the Angels of the ſeven* Aſian *Churches, let them be diſclamed as uſurpers.* Will our Biſhops indeed ſtand to this? then *actum eſt*. Did ever *Apoſtolique Authority* delegate power to *Timothy* or *Tytus*, to ordain alone? to govern alone? and do not our Biſhops challenge that power? Did ever *Apoſtolique Authority* delegate power to *Timothy* and *Titus*, to rebuke an Elder? no; *but to entreat him as a Father*: and do not our Biſhops challenge themſelves and permit to their *Chancellors*, *Commiſſaries*, and *Officals* power not only to *Rebuke an Elder*, but to *raile upon an Elder*? to reproach him with the moſt approbious termes of *fool*, *knave*, *jack-ſauce*, &c. which our paper bluſhes to preſent to your *Honours* view? Did ever *Apoſtolick Authority* delegate to *Timothy* and *Titus* power to receive an accuſation againſt an *Elder*, but before two or three witneſſes? and do not our Biſhops challenge to proceed *Ex Officio*, and make the Elders their own Accuſers? Did ever *Apoſtolick Authority* delegate power to *Timothy* or *Titus*, to reject any after twice admonition but an *Heretick*? and do not our Biſhops challenge power to reject and eject the moſt *ſound* and *Orthodox* of our *Miniſters*, for refuſing the uſe of a *Ceremony*? as if *Non-conformity* were *Hereſie*. So that either our *Biſhops muſt diſclaim this* Remonſtrance, or elſe *themſelves muſt be diſclaimed as uſurpers.*

But if *Timothy* and *Titus* were no Biſhops, or had not this power, it may be the Angels of the *ſeven* Aſian *Churches* had; and our Remonſtrant is ſo ſubtile as to twiſt theſe two together, that if one fail the other may hold.

To which we anſwer; firſt, that the Angel in thoſe Epiſtles is but *Collectively*, not *Individually*; as appears by the *Epiſtle* to *Thyatira*, *cap.* 2. *verſe* 25. where we read ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς, &c. But I ſay unto *you* (in the plural number, not unto *thee* in the ſingular) *and to the reſt in* Thyatira, &c. Here is a plain diſtinction between the members of that Church. By *you*, is ſignified thoſe to whom he ſpake under the name of the Angel. By *the reſt*, the riſidue of the people. The people governed, and the governours in the plural number. What can be more evident

to prove, that by *Angel* is meant not one ſingular perſon, but the whole company of *Presbyters* that were in *Thyatira*.

This alſo further appears, becauſe it is uſual with the Holy Ghoſt, not only in other Books of the Scripture, but alſo in this very Book of the *Revelation*, to expreſſe a company under one ſingular perſon. Thus the Civil State of *Rome*, as oppoſite to Chriſt, is called *A beaſt with ten hornes*: and the Eccleſiaſtical State Antichriſtian is called *the whore of Babylon*, and *the falſe Prophet*; and the Devil and all his family is called *An old red Dragon*. Thus alſo the ſeven Angels that blew the ſeven trumpets, *Revel.* 8. 2. And the ſeven Angels that poured out the ſeven Vialls, are not literally to be taken, but Synecdochically, as all know. And why not then the ſeven Angels in thoſe Epiſtles? Maſter *Mede* in his Commentaries upon the *Revelation*, pag. 265. hath theſe words; *Denique ut (jam ſemel iterumque monuimus) quoniam Deus adhibet angelos providentiæ ſuæ in rerum humanarum motibus & converſionibus ciendis, gubernandiſque adminiſtris: idcirco, quæ multorum manibus peraguntur, Angelo tamen tanquam rei gerendæ* præſidi & Duci *pro communi loquendi modo tribuuntur.*

Add, thirdly, that the very name *Angel* is ſufficient to prove, that it is not meant of one perſon alone, becauſe the word *Angel* doth not import any peculiar juriſdiction or preheminence, but is a common name to all Miniſters, and ſo is uſed in Scripture. For all Miniſters are Gods Meſſengers and Embaſſadours, ſent for the good of the Elect. And therefore the name being common to all Miniſters, why ſhould we think that there ſhould be any thing ſpoken to one Miniſter, that doth not belong to all? The like argument we draw from the word *Starrs* uſed *Revelations* 1. 20. *The ſeven Starrs are the Angels of the ſeven Churches.* Now it is evident, that all faithfull Miniſters are called Starrs in Scripture, whoſe duty is to ſhine as lights unto the Churches, in all purity of doctrine and holineſs of converſation. And in this ſenſe, the word is uſed, when it is ſaid, that *the third part of the ſtarrs were darkned.* Rev. 8. 12. And that the *Dragons taile drew the third part of the ſtarrs of Heaven, and caſt them to the Earth*, Rev. 12. 4. Which is meant not onely of Biſhops, but of other Miniſters, unleſs the Biſhops will appropriate all corruption and Apoſtacy unto themſelves.

Add, fourthly, out of the Text it ſelf, it is very obſervable, that our Saviour in opening the myſtery of the Viſion, *Rev.* 1. 20. ſaith; *The ſeven Candleſticks which thou ſaweſt, were the ſeven Churches*, but he doth not ſay, The ſeven ſtarrs are the ſeven Angels of the ſame Churches, *But the Angels of the ſeven Churches*; wherein not without ſome myſtery the number of the Angels is omitted, leaſt we ſhould underſtand by Angel, one Miniſter alone, and not a company. And yet the Septenary number of the Churches is twice ſet down.

Laſtly, though but one Angel be mentioned in the fore-front, yet it is evident, that the Epiſtles themſelves are dedicated to all the Angels, and

and Miniſters in every Church, and to the Churches themſelves: And if to the whole Church, much more to the *Presbyters* of that Church. This is proved *Revelations* 1.11. *What thou ſeeſt, write in a Book, and ſend it to the ſeven Churches which are in* Aſia. And alſo by the Epiphonema of every Epiſtle; *He that hath an ear to hear, let him hear what the Spirit ſaith unto the Churches.* Upon which words, *Ambroſius Ausbertus* in his ſecond Book upon the *Revelation*, ſaith thus; *Una eademque locutione & Angelos & Eccleſias unum eſſe deſignat. Nam cum in principio locutionum que ad ſeptem fiunt Angelos dicat, & Angelo illius Eccleſiæ ſcribe; in fine tamen earundem non dicit, Qui habet aurum audiat quod ſpiritus dicat Angelo, ſed quid Eccleſiæ dicat.* By one and the ſame phraſe of ſpeech he ſheweth, the Angels and the Churches to be one and the ſame. For whereas in the beginning of his ſpeech, which he makes to the ſeven Churches, he ſaith, *And write to the Angel of the Churches*, yet in the cloſe of the ſame, he doth not ſay, He that hath an Eare, let him hear what the Spirit ſaith to the Angel, but *what he ſaith to the Church.* And this is further proved by the whole argument of thoſe Epiſtles, wherein the admonitions, threatnings, commendations, and reproofs, are directed to all the Miniſters of all the Churches, *Revel.* 2. 10. *The Devil ſhall caſt ſome of you into priſon, &c.* Revel. 2. 16. *I will fight againſt them with the ſword of my mouth*, Revel. 2. 24. *I will put upon you no other burthen, &c. I ſay unto you and the reſt of* Thyatira, *as many as have not this Doctrine, and which have not known the depths of Satan, &c.* And when it is ſaid in the ſingular number (as it is often) *I know thy works and labour, &c.* verſ. 2. and verſe 4. *Repent and do thy firſt works*; and verſe 13. *Thou haſt not denied my Faith, &c.* and *cap.* 3. 26. *Becauſe thou art neither hot nor cold, &c.* All theſe and the like places, are not to be underſtood as meant of one individual perſon, but of the whole company of Miniſters, and alſo of the whole Church, becauſe that the puniſhment threatned, is to the whole Church; *Revelations* 2. 5. *Repent and do thy firſt works, or elſe I will come unto thee quickly and remove thy Candleſtick out of his place* Revelat. 2. 16. *Repent, or elſe I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight againſt thee with the ſword of my mouth*; Revelations 2. 24. *I will not put upon you any other Burthen.* Now we have no warrant in the Word to think that Chriſt would remove his Goſpel from a Church for the ſin of one Biſhop, when all the other Miniſters, and the Churches themſelves are free from thoſe ſins. And if God ſhould take this courſe, in what a wofull and miſerable condition ſhould the Church of *England* be? which groaneth under ſo many corrupt Prelates? By all this it appeares, that the word *Angel*, is not to be taken, ἰδιωτικῶς, but συλλητικῶς; not properly, but figuratively. And this is the judgement of Maſter *Perkins* upon the ſecond Chapter of the *Revelation*: and of Maſter *Brightman*, and of Doctor *Fulke*, who in anſwer to the Rhemiſts in *Apoc.* 1. 20. hath theſe words: St. *John* by the Angels of the Churches

 meaneth

meaneth not that all that ſhould wear on their heads Miters, and hold croſier ſtaves in their hands, like dead Idols, but them that are the faithful meſſengers of Gods Word, and utter and declare the ſame. Again they are called the Angels of the Churches, becauſe they be Gods meſſengers.

Maſter *Fox* likewiſe in his Meditation upon the *Revelation* (page 7. 9. 17.) is of this opinion, and hath gathered to our hands the opinions of all Interpreters he could meet, and ſaith that they all conſent in this, that under the perſon of an Angel, the Paſtors and Miniſters of the Churches were underſtood. St. *Auſtin* in his 132. Epiſtle. ſaith thus, *Sic enim in Apocalypſi legitur Angelus, &c. Quod ſi de Angelo ſuperiorum cœlorum, & non de* Præpoſitis Eccleſiarum *vellit intelligi, non conſequenter diceret*, Habeo adverſum te, &c. And ſo in his ſecond Homily upon the *Revelation* (if that book be his) *Quod autem dicit Angelo Thyatiræ.* Habeo adverſum te pauca, *dicit* Præpoſitis Eccleſiarum, &c. This alſo *Gregory* the Great, *lib.* 34. *Moral. in Job cap* 4. *Sæpe ſacram ſcripturam prædicatores Eccleſiæ pro eo quod patris gloriam annunciant, angelorum nomine ſolere deſignare: & hinc eſſe, quod Johannes in Apocalypſi* ſeptem Eccleſiis ſcribens, angelis Eccleſiarum loquitur, *id eſt*, Prædicatoribus populorum, Maſter *Fox* citeth *Primaſius*, *Haymo*, *Beda*, *Richard*, *Thomas*, and others, to whom we refer you.

If it be here demanded (as it is much by the Hierarchical-ſide (that if by Angel be meant the whole company of *Presbyters*, why Chriſt did not ſay to the Angels in the plural number, but to the Angel in the ſingular?

We anſwer, that though this queſtion may ſavour of a little too much curioſity, yet we will make bold to ſubjoyn three conjectural reaſons of this phraſe of ſpeech.

Firſt, it is ſo uſed in this place, becauſe it is the common language of other Scriptures in types and viſions to ſet down a certain number for an uncertain, and the ſingular number for the plurall. Thus the Ram, *Dan.* 8. 3. is interpreted verſe 20. to be the Kings of *Media* and *Perſia*. And the enemies of Gods Church are ſet out by four hornes. And the deliverers by four Carpenters, *Zach.* 1. 18, 20. And the wiſe and fooliſh Virgins are ſaid to be five wiſe and five fooliſh. And many ſuch like. And therefore as we anſwer the Papiſts, when they demand why Chriſt, if he meant figuratively when he ſaith, *this is my body?* and did not ſpeak in plain language, *this is the ſigne of my body?* We ſay, that this phraſe of ſpeech is proper to all Sacraments: So we alſo anſwer here, his phraſe of ſpeech *Angel* for *Angels*, is common to all types and viſions.

Secondly, Angel is put, though more be meant, that ſo it may hold proportion with the viſion which *John* ſaw, Chap. 1, 12. 20. *He ſaw ſeven Golden Candelſticks, and ſeven ſtars.* And therefore to hold proportion, the Epiſtles are directed to ſeven Angels and to ſeven Churches.

And

And this is called a Myſtery, *Rev.* 1.20. *The myſtery of the ſeven Starrs*, &c. Now a Myſtery is a ſecret which comprehends more than is expreſſed; and therefore though but one Angel be expreſſed, yet the Myſtery implies all the Angels of that Church.

Thirdly, To ſignifie their Union in the Miniſterial Function, and joynt Commiſſion to attend upon the feeding and governing of one Church, with one common care, as it were with one hand and heart. And this is more fitly declared by the name of one Angel, than of many. We often find the name of (one) Prophet or Prieſt to be put for the general Body of the Miniſtry, or whole multitudes of Prophets or Prieſts, in the Church of *Iſrael* or *Judah*, when the Spirit of God intendeth to reprove, threaten, or admoniſh them. Thus it is, *Jerem.* 6. 13, 18, 19. *Iſa.* 3. 2. *Hoſea* 9. 8. *Ezek.* 7. 26. *Hoſea* 4. 6. *Mal.* 2. 7. Neither ſhould it ſeem ſtrange, that a multitude or company of Miniſters ſhould be underſtood under the name of one Angel, ſeeing a multitude of Heavenly Angels (imployed in one Service for the good of Gods Saints) is ſometimes in the Scripture ſhut up under one Angel in the ſingular number, as may be gathered from *Gen.* 14. 7. 2 *Kings* 19. 35. *Pſal.* 34. 7. compared with *Pſal.* 91. 11. *Gen.* 32. 1. 2 *Kings* 6. 16. 17. And alſo a multitude of Devils or evil Angels, joyntly labouring in any one work, is ſet forth under the name of one evil or unclean ſpirit, 1 *Kings* 22. 21, 22. *Mark* 1. 23, 24. *Mark* 5. 29. *Luke* 4. 33, 34. *Luke* 8. 27, 30. 1 *Pet.* 5. 8. *Heb.* 2. 14. *Eph.* 6. 11, 12.

Now let us ſuppoſe (which yet notwithſtanding we will not grant) that the word *Angel* is taken individually for one particular perſon, as Doctor *Reynolds* ſeems to interpret it, together with Maſter *Beza*, yet nevertheleſs, there will nothing follow out of this acception, that will any waies make for the upholding of a Dioceſan Biſhop, with ſole power of Ordination and Juriſdiction, as a diſtinct Superiour to *Presbyters*. And this appears;

Firſt, Becauſe it never was yet proved nor ever will (as we conceive) that theſe Angels were Dioceſan Biſhops, conſidering that Pariſhes were not divided into Dioceſſes in St. *Johns* daies. And the ſeven Stars are ſaid to be fixed in their ſeven Candleſticks or Churches, not one Star over divers Candleſticks. Neither can thoſe Churches be thought to be a Dioceſan, when not only *Tindal* and the old Tranſlation, calls them ſeven Congregations, but we read alſo *Acts* 20. that at *Epheſus* which was one of thoſe Candleſticks, there was but one Flock.

And ſecondly, we further find that in *Epheſus* one of thoſe ſeven Churches, there were many *Presbyters*, which are all called Biſhops, *Acts* 20. 28. And we find no colour of any ſuperintendency or ſuperiority of one Biſhop over another. To them in general the Church is committed to be fed by them without any reſpect had to *Timothy*, who ſtood at his Elbow, and had been with him in *Macedonia*, and was now

waiting

waiting upon him to *Jeruſalem*. This is alſo confirmed by *Epiphanius*, who writing of the Hereſies of the *Miletians*, ſaith, that in ancient times this was peculiar to *Alexandria*, that it had but one Biſhop, whereas other Cities had two. And he being Biſhop of *Cypres*, might well be acquainted with the condition of the Churches of *Aſia*, which were ſo nigh unto him.

Thirdly, There is nothing ſaid in the ſeven Epiſtles, that implieth any ſuperiority or majority of rule or power that theſe Angels had over the other Angels that were joyned with them in their Churches. It is written indeed, in commendation of the Angel of the Church of *Epheſus*, *that he could not bear them that were evil, and that he had tried them which ſay they were Apoſtles and are not, and had found them Lyars.* And it is ſpoken in diſpraiſe of the Angel of *Pergamus*, *that he ſuffered them which held the Doctrine of Balaam*, &c. But theſe things are common duties requirable at the hands of all Miniſters, who have the charge of ſouls.

But ſuppoſe that there were ſome ſuperiority and preheminency inſinuated by this individual Angel, yet who knoweth not that there are divers kinds of Superiority? to wit, of Order, of Dignity, of Gifts and Parts, or in degree of Miniſtry, or in charge of power and juriſdiction. And how will it be proved that this Angel if he had a ſuperiority, had any more than a ſuperiority of Order, or of Gifts and Parts? Where is it ſaid, that this Angel was a ſuperiour degree or order of Miniſtry above *Presbyters*? In which Epiſtle is it ſaid that this Angel had ſole power of Ordination and Juriſdiction? And therefore as our Learned Proteſtants prove againſt the Papiſts, that where Chriſt directed his Speech to *Peter* in particular, and ſaid, *I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, &c. That this particularization of *Peter* did not import any ſingular preheminence or majority of power to *Peter* more than to the other Apoſtles; But that though the promiſe was made to *Peter*, yet it was made to him in the name of all the reſt, and given to all as well as one. And that therefore it was ſpoken to one perſon, and not to all; that ſo Chriſt might fore-ſignifie the unity of his Church, as * *Cyprian*, *Auſtin*, *Hierom*, *Optatus*, and others ſay. So when Chriſt directs an Epiſtle to an Angel, it doth not imply a ſuperiour power over his Fellow-Angels, but at moſt only a Preſidency for order ſake. And that which is written to him, is written to the reſt as well as to him. And therefore written to one, not to exclude the reſt, but to denote the Unity that ought to be between the Miniſters of the ſame Church in their common care and diligence to their Flock. And this is all that Doctor *Reynolds* ſaith, as you may read in his Conference with *Hart*, *cap.* 4. *diviſ.* 3. *ad finem*. For it is evident that Doctor *Reynolds* was an utter enemy to the *Jus Divinum* of the Epiſcopal preheminency over *Presbyters*, by his Letter to Sir *Francis Knolls*.

* *Hic erat ut que cæteri Apoſtoli quod fuerat Petrus pari conſortio præditi honoris & poteſtatis ſed exordium ab unitate proficiſcitur, ut Eccleſia una monſtretur.*

Knolls. And learned Maſter *Beza* alſo ſaith ſomething to the ſame purpoſe in his Annotations upon *Revelations* 2. 1. *Angelo i.* ἐπισκόπῳ *quem minimum oportuit imprimis de his rebus admoneri, ac per eum cæteros collegas totamq; adeo Eccleſiam. Sed hinc ſtatui Epiſcopalis ille gradus poſtea humanitus in Eccleſiam Dei invectus, certe nec poteſt nec debet, immo ne perpetuum quidem iſtud* ἐπισκόπων *munus eſſe neceſſario oportuiſſe, ſicut exorta inde Tyrannys Oligarchica (cujus apex eſt Antichriſtiana beſtia) certiſſima cum totius non Eccleſiæ modo, ſed etiam orbis pernicie, nunc tandem declarat.*

If therefore our *Remonſtrant* can produce no better Evidence for his Hierarchy than *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the *Angels of the Aſian Churches*, Let not this Remonſtrant and his Party, cry out of wrong, *if this claimed Hierarchy be for ever rooted out of the Church*, ſeeing it is his own Option. And yet we cannot conceal one Refuge more out of Scripture, to which the Hierarchy betake themſelves for ſhelter: And that is the two Poſtcripts in the end of *Pauls* ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, and of that to *Titus*; where in the one, *Timothy* is ſaid to be the firſt Biſhop of *EPHESUS*; and in the other, *Titus* is ſaid to be the firſt Biſhop of the Church of the *CRETIANS*: to both which places we anſwer:

That theſe two Poſtſcripts (and ſo all the reſt) are no part of Canonical Scripture. And therefore our former and ancienter Engliſh Tranſlations, though they have theſe Poſtſcripts, yet they are put in a ſmall Character different from that of the Text. Although our Epiſcopal men of late in newer Impreſſions have enlarged their Phylacteries, in putting theſe Poſtſcripts in the ſame full Character with that of the Text, that the ſimple might believe they are Canonical Scripture. The *PAPISTS* themſelves (*Baronius*, *Serrarius*, and the Rhemiſts) confeſs that there is much falſity in them. The firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, is thus ſubſcribed: *the firſt to* Timothy *was written from* Laodicea, *which is the chiefeſt City of* Phrygia Pacatiana. Here we demand, whether *PAUL* when he writ the Firſt Epiſtle to *TIMOTHY*, was aſſured he ſhould live to write a Second, which was written long after? And if not; How comes it to be ſubſcribed, *the firſt to Timothy*, which hath relation to a Second? Beſides, the Epiſtle is ſaid to be writ from *Laodicea*, whereas *Beza* in his Annotations proves apparently, that it was written from *Macedonia*; to which Opinion *Baronius* and *Serrarius* ſubſcribe. It is added, *Which is the chiefeſt City of Phrygia Pacatiana.* But this Epithet is no where read in the Writers of thoſe ages, ſaith *Beza*, *Sed apud recentiores illas, qui Romani Imperii jam inclinantis provincias deſcripſerunt.* So that by this place it is evident, that the Subſcription was added a long while after the writing

writing of the Epiſtles by ſome men, for the moſt part *vel indoctis*, ſaith *Beza*, *vel certe non ſatis attentis*, Either by a Learned or negligent man.

The Second Epiſtle is thus deſcribed; *The Second Epiſtle unto* Timothy, *ordained the firſt Biſhop of the Church of the* Epheſians, *was written from* Rome, *when* Paul *was brought before* Nero *the ſecond time.* Now theſe words *Ordained the firſt Biſhop*, is wanting, ſaith *Beza*, *in quibuſdam vetuſtis Codicibus, in veteri vulgatâ Editione, & apud Syrum Interpretem.* If Saint *Paul* had written this Poſtſcript, he would not have ſaid, *To* Timothy *the firſt Biſhop*, &c. Whereas it was not yet certain whether ever there ſhould be a ſecond. Neither would it be ſaid, when *Paul was brought*, &c. But when I was the ſecond time brought before *Nero*. The Syriack Interpreter reads it, *Here ends* the *Second Epiſtle to* Timothy *written from* Rome.

The Epiſtle to *Titus* is thus deſcribed: *Written to* Titus, *Ordained firſt Biſhop of the Church of the* Cretians, *from* Nicopolis *of* Macedonia. Here it is ſaid that this Epiſtle was written from *Nicopolis*, whereas it is clear that *Paul* was not at *Nicopolis* when he wrote it, *Titus* 3. 12. *Be diligent to come to me at* Nicopolis, *for I have determined there to winter.* He doth not ſay, *Here to winter*, but *There*. Where note, for the preſent he was not there. And beſides it is ſaid, that *Titus* was *Ordained the firſt Biſhop*, &c. And who was the Second? Or was there ever a Second? And alſo, *He is ſaid to be a Biſhop*, not only of a Dioceſs, *but of all Creet.* Was there ever ſuch a ſecond Biſhop? Add Laſtly, that it is ſaid, *Biſhop of the Church of the* Cretians; Whereas it would be ſaid of the *Churches of the Cretians.* For the Chriſtian Churches of any Nation are called Churches by *Luke* and *Paul*, not Church. Therefore *Codex Claremontanus* ſubſcribes; *Here ends the Epiſtle to* Titus, and no more. So the Syriack; *Finitur epiſtola ad* Titum *quæ ſcripta fuit è Nicopoli.* The old Vulgar Edition hath nothing of the Epiſcopacy of *Titus*. By all this it appears, that if the Biſhops had no more authority to urge us to ſubſcribe to their Ceremonies, then they have authority for their Epiſcopal Dignity by theſe Subſcriptions, there would be no more ſubſcription to Ceremonies in the Churches of *England*.

But ſome will ſay, that there is one Objection out of Scripture yet unanſwered, and that is from the inequality that was between the twelve Apoſtles, and the ſeventy Diſciples.

To which we anſwer;

Firſt, That it cannot be proved that the twelve Apoſtles had any ſuperiority over the ſeventy, either of Ordination, or Juriſdiction, or that there was any ſubordination of the ſeventy unto the twelve: but ſuppoſe it was, yet we anſwer;

Secondly,

Secondly, that a ſuperiority and inferiority between Officers of different kinds, will not prove that there ſhould be a ſuperiority and inferiority between Officers of the ſame kind. No man will deny, but that in Chriſt's time there were Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, Prophets, Paſtors, and Teachers, and that the Apoſtles were Superiour to Evangeliſts and Paſtors: But it cannot be prov'd, that one Apoſtle had any ſuperiority over another Apoſtle, or one Evangeliſt over another. And why then ſhould one Preſbiter be over another? Hence it followeth, that though we ſhould grant a ſuperiority between the twelve and the ſeventy, yet this will not prove the queſtion in hand. Becauſe the queſtion is concerning Officers of the ſame kind, and the inſtance is of Officers of different kinds, amongſt whom no man will deny but there may be a ſuperiority and inferiority, as there is amongſt us between Presbyters and Deacons.

And now let your *Honours* judge (conſidering the premiſſes) how far this Epiſcopal government is from any *Divine right*, or *Apoſtolical Inſtitution*: And how true that ſpeech of *Hierome* is, that a Biſhop as it is a ſuperiour Order to a Presbyter, is *a Humane preſumption*, not a *Divine Ordinance*.

But though Scripture fails them, yet the indulgence and Munificence of *Religious Princes* may ſupport them, and to this the *Remonſtrant* makes his next recourſe, yet ſo as he acknowledgeth here, *Ingagements to Princes onely for their acceſſory dignities, titles, and Maintenance; not at all for their ſtations and functions,* (wherein yet the author plainly acknowledgeth a difference between our *Biſhops* and the *Biſhops of old* by ſuch acceſſions,)

For our parts, we are ſo far from envying the *gratious Munificence of pious Princes, in collating honourable maintenance upon the Miniſters of Chriſt*, that we believe, that *even by Gods own Ordinance, double Honour* is due unto them.

And that by how much the *Miniſtry of the Goſpel* is more *honourable* than that of *the Law*, by ſo much the more ought all that embrace the *Goſpel*, to be careful to provide, that the *Miniſters of the Goſpel* might not only live, but maintain Hoſpitality, according to the Rule of the *Goſpel*. And that *worthy Gentelman* ſpake as an Oracle, that ſaid, *That ſcanda'ous Maintenance is a great cauſe of ſcandalous Miniſters.*

Yet we are not ignorant, that when the Miniſtry came to have *Agros, domus, locationes, vehicula, equos, latifundia*, as *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 86. *in Matth.* That then *Religio peperit divitias, & filia devoravit Matrem*, Religion brought forth ritches, and the Daughter devoured the Mother; And then there was a voice of *Angels* heard from heaven; *Hodie venenum in Eccleſiam Chriſti cecidit.* This day is poyſon ſhed into the Church of Chriſt.

And then it was that *Jerom* complained, *Chriſti Eccleſia poſtquam ad Chriſtianos principes venit, potentia quidem & divitiis major, ſed virtutibus*

bus minor facta est. Then also was that conjunction found true; That when they *had wooden Chalices*, they had *Golden Priests*; but when their *Chalices were golden, their Priests were wooden.*

And though we do not think, there is any such *incompossibility*, but that *large Revenues may be happily managed with an humble sociableness*, yet is very rare to find. History tells us, that the superfluous revenues of the *Bishops* not only made them neglect their *Ministery*, but further ushered in their stately and pompous attendance; which did so elevate their spirits that they insulted over their brethren, both *Clergy* and *People*, and gave occasion to others to hate and abhor the Christian Faith; Which *Eusebius* sets forth fully in the pride of *Paulus Samosatenus*, who notwithstanding the meanness and obscurity of his birth, afterwards grew to that *height of insolency and pride* in all his carriage, especially in that numerous train that attended him in the streets, and in his stately Throne raised after the manner of Kings and Princes, that *Fides nostra invidia, & odio, propter fastum & superbiam cordis illius, facta fuerit ob-noxia*; The Christian Faith was exposed to envy and hatred through his pride.

Euseb. li. 7. cap. 37.

And as their ambition (fed with the largeness of their revenues) discovered it selfe in great attendance, stately dwellings, and all Lordly pomp, so *Hierom* complains of their pride in their stately seats *qui velut in aliqua sublimi specula constituti, vix dignantur videre mortales & alloqui conservos suos*: who sitting aloft as it were in a watch-tower, will scarce deigne to look upon poor mortals, to speak to their fellow-servants.

Here we might be large in multiplying several testimonies against the pride of Ecclesiastical persons, that the largeness of their revenues raised them too: but we will conclude with that grave complaint of *Sulpitius Severus.*

Ille qui ante pedibus aut asello ire consueverat, spumante equo superbus invehitur; parva prius ac vili cellula contentus habitare, erigit celsa Laquearia, construit multa conclavia, sculpit postes, pingit armaria, vestem respuit grossiorem, indumentum molle desiderat, &c. Which because the practice of our times hath already turned into English, we spare the labour to translate.

Only suffer us (being now to give a *Vale* to our Remonstrants arguments) to recollect some few things.

First, where as this Remonstrant saith; *If we do not shew out of the true and genuine writings of those holy men, that lived in the Apostles daies, a clear and received distinction of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, as three distinct subordinate callings, with an evident specification of the duty belonging to each of them: Let this claimed Hierarchy be for ever rooted out of the Church:*

Pag. 22.

We beseech you, let it be remembred how we have proved out of the *genuine* and *undeniable writings of the Apostles themselves*, that these are not three

three distinct callings: *Bishops* are Presbyters, *being with them all one, Name and Office*, and that the distinction of Bishops and Presbyters was not of *Divine* Institution, but Humane: and that these Bishops, in their first Institution did not differ so much from Presbyters, as our present Bishops differ from them.

Secondly, Whereas this Remonstrant saith, *If our Bishops challenge any other power then was by Apostolick authority delegated to, and required of* Timothy *and* Titus, *and the Angels of the Asian Churches*: Let them be disclaimed as usurpers. We desire it may be remembered, how we have proved first, that *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the Angels who are Diocesan Bishops; and secondly, that our Bishops challenge (if not in their Polemicks, yet in their practicks) a power that *Timothy* and *Titus*, and those Angels never did. pag. 24.

Thirdly, Whereas this Remonstrant saith, *If there can be better evidence under heaven for any matter of fact, let Episcopacy be for ever abandoned out of Gods Church.* We beseech you remember how weak we have discovered his evidence to be; and then the *Inference* upon all these *we humbly* leave to your *Honours wisdom and Justice*. pag. 23.

SECT. XIV.

HAving thus considered the validity of those arguments, whereby this *Remonstrant* would suffult *Episcopacy*, we descend now to inquire what satisfaction he gives to those objections, which himself frames as the main, if not the sole arguments, that *Episcopacy* is assaultable by, and they are two.

First, *that pleading the Divine right of Episcopacy is to the prejudice of Sovereignty.* Secondly, *that it casts a dangerous imputation upon all those Reformed Churches that want this Government.*

To the first, the *prejudice of Sovereignty*; he answers there is a compatibleness in this case of *Gods Act*, and the Kings: it is God that makes the Bishop, the King that gives the Bishoprick.

But we have proved already, that God never made a Bishop, as he stands in his *Superiority* over all other *Presbyters*, he never had Gods *Fiat*: and if they disclaim the influence of Sovereignty unto their *creation* to a priority, and assert that the King doth not make them *Bishops*, they must have no being at all. Sure we are, the Laws of the Land proclaim, that not only *Bishopricks, but Bishops and all the jurisdiction* they have, is from the King: whereas the *Remonstrant* acknowledgeth no more, but the bare place and exercise to be from *Regal donation*, which cannot be affirmed without apparent prejudice of that Sovereignty which the Laws of the Land have invested our Princes with. 37 *H.*8. *cap.* 17.

* The Remonstrant here acknowledges the same of a Bishop

the King, that Frier *Simon a Florentine* did of the Pope, who affirmed the degree of was *de jure divino*, but every particular Bishop *de jure Pontificio*. *Hist. con. Trid.* pag. 28, 29.

And for his unworthy comparison of *Kings* in order to *Bishops*, and *Patrons* in order to their *Clerks*, when he shall prove that the *Patron* gives *ministerial power* to his *Clerk*, as the *King* according to our Lawes gives *Episcopal power* to the *Bishop*, it may be of some conducement to his cause; but till then, we leave the unfitnesse of this comparison, and the unthankfulnes of those men to the indulgence of their Sovereign, to their deserved recompence.

His learned answer to such men as borrowing St. *Jeromes* phrase, speak St. *Pauls* truth, is in sum this:

That he knows not how to prescribe to mens thoughts, but for all his Rhetoricke they will think what they list; but if they will grant him the question, they shall soon be at an end of the quarrel: which one answer, if *satisfactory*, would silence all controversies to as good purpose as he did *Bellarmine*, who said, *Bellarmine* saith it is thus, and I say it is not, and where is *Bellarmine* now?

Pag. 29. To the second objection, *that Episcopacy thus asserted casts an imputation upon all the reformed Churches, that want that Government*, he saith, *that the objection is intended to raise envy against them*, who (if they may be believed) *love and honour those sister Churches, and blesse God for them.*

But do they out-pluck all this envy upon themselves, who in their *Conferences, Writings, Pulpits, Universities, Disputes, High Commissions, Declamations, have disclaimed them as no Churches, that have disclaimed the Prelats* and have honoured the most *glorious Lights of those reformed Churches, Calvin, Beza*, and others with no better titles then of *Rascals, Blasphemers*, &c.

But the pith of his answer after a few good words is this, that no such consequent can be drawn from their opinion; for their *Jus Divinum* pleads only for a *justifiableness of this holy calling*: not for absolute necessity of it, *warranting it where it is, and requiring it where it may be had; but not fixing upon the Church that wants it, the defect of any thing of the Essence of a Church, but only of the glory and perfection of it*; neither is it their sin, but their misery,

And is it so, doth not this *Jus Divinum* argue a *Necessity*, but only a *justifiablenesse* of this calling? nor is the want of it a want of any thing of Essence, but only of perfection? we have thought, that pag. the 20th. where this *Remonstrant* strives to fetch the *Pedegree of Episcopacy* from no lesse then *Apostolical*, and in that right *Divine institution* he had reckoned it among those things, which the *Apostles* ordained for the succeeding administration of the Church *in essential matters*: but here it seems he is willing to retract what there fell from him: there it was to his advantage to say, this Government was a thing essential to the Church, and here it is no lesse advantage to say, it is not essential.

But if it be not Essential, then what is the reason that when a *Priest* who hath received Orders at *Rome*, turns to us, they urge not him to receive

ceive Ordination among us again: But when ſome of our brethren, who flying in Queen *Maries* daies, had received *Impoſition of hands* in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, returned again in the daies of Queen *Elizabeth*, they were urged to receive Impoſition of hands again from our Biſhops, and ſome did receive it. If thoſe Churches that want Biſhops, want nothing eſſential to a Church, then what *Eſſential* want was there in the Ordination of thoſe *Miniſters* that received Impoſition of hands in thoſe Churches, that might deſerve a *re-ordination*, more than if they had firſt received their Ordination at *Rome*?

And what is the reaſon that Biſhop *Mountague* ſo confidently affirms, that Ordination by Epiſcopal hands is ſo neceſſary, as that the Church is no true Church without it, and the Miniſtry no true Miniſtry, and ordinarily no ſalvation to be obtained without it? And if this *Remonſtrant* ſhould leave Biſhop *Mountague* to anſwer for him himſelf, yet notwithſtanding he ſtands bound to give us ſatisfaction to theſe two queſtions, which ariſe from his own Book. *Ori. inum Eccleſiaſticorum tomi prioris pars poſterioris* 463, 464

Firſt, Whether that *Office* which by *divine right* hath the *ſole power of ordaining*, and *ruling* all other *Officers* in the Church (as he ſaith Epiſcopacy hath) belong not to the being, but only to the glory and perfection of a Church?

Secondly, There being (in this mans thoughts) the ſame *Jus divinum* for Biſhops, that there is for *Paſtors* and *Elders*, whether if thoſe *reformed Churches* wanted *Paſtors* and *Elders* too, they ſhould want nothing of the *Eſſence* of a Church, but of the *perfection and glory of it*?

But this *Remonſtrant* ſeems to know ſo much of the mind of thoſe Churches, *that if they might have their option, they would moſt gladly embrace Epiſcopal Government, as little differing from their own Moderatorſhip, ſave only in the perpetuity of it, and the new invention* (as he odiouſly cals it) *of lay-Elders.* But no queſtion thoſe learned Worthies that were intruſted *by the Churches to compile their Confeſſions, did comprize their Judgments better than the Compoſer of this Remonſtrance.* And to his preſumption, we oppoſe their Confeſſion. We will begin with the French Church, who in their Confeſſion ſpeak thus:

Credimus veram Eccleſiam gubernari debere eâ politiâ, quam Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus ſancivit, ità videlicet, ut ſint in ea Paſtores, Presbyteri, ſive Seniores & Diaconi, ut doctrinæ puritas retineatur, &c. Art. 29. *Credimus omnes Paſtores ubicun-*

We believe that the true Church ought to be governed by that policy which Chriſt Jeſus our Lord eſtabliſhed, *viz.* that there be Paſtors, Presbyters, or Elders, & Deacons. And again, We believe, that all true Paſtors where-

ever

que collocati ſunt, eâdem & æquali poteſtate inter ſe eſſe præditos ſub uno illo capite ſummoq; & ſolo univerſali Epiſcopo Jeſu Chriſto. Art. 30. *Gallicæ Confeſſionis. Credimus veram hanc Eccleſiam debere regi, ac gubernari, ſpirituali illâ politiâ, quam nos Deus ipſe in verbo ſuo edocuit; ità ut ſint in ea Paſtores ac Miniſtri, qui purè & concionentur, & Sacramenta adminiſtrent; ſint quoq; Seniores & Diaconi, qui Eccleſiæ Senatum conſtituant, ut his veluti mediis vera Religio conſervari, Homineſq; vitiis dediti ſpiritualiter corripi & emendari poſſint. Tunc enim ritè & ordinatè omnia fiunt in Eccleſiâ, cum viri fideles, & pii ad ejus gubernationem deliguntur juxta divi* Pauli *præſcriptum,* 1 Tim. 3. *Confeſ. Belgic.* Art. 30. *Cæterùm ubicunq; locorum ſunt verbi Dei Miniſtri, eandem atq; æqualem* Omnes *habent tum* Poteſtatem *tum* Authoritatem, *ut qui ſunt æquè Omnes Chriſti unici illius univerſalis Epiſcopi & capitis Eccleſiæ Miniſtri.*

ever they be, are endued with equal and the ſame power, under one chief Head and Biſhop Chriſt Jeſus. Conſonant to this the *Dutch* Churches: We believe (ſay they) the true Church ought to be ruled with that ſpiritual policy which God hath taught us in his Word, to wit, that there be in it Paſtors to preach the Word purely, Elders and Deacons to conſtitute the Eccleſiaſtical Senate, that by theſe means Religion may be preſerved, and Manners corrected. And ſo again, We believe where ever the Miniſters of God are placed, they *All* have the ſame *equal power* and *authority*, as being all equally the Miniſters of Chriſt.

In which Harmony of theſe Confeſſions, ſee how both Churches agree in theſe five points:

1. Firſt, That there is in the Word of God, an exact form of government ſet down; *Deus in verbo ſuo edocuit.*
2. Secondly, That this form of Government Chriſt eſtabliſhed in his Church; *Jeſus Chriſtus in Eccleſia ſancivit.*
3. Thirdly, That this form of Government is by Paſtors, Elders, and Deacons.
4. Fourthly, That the true Church of Chriſt ought to be thus governed; *Veram Eccleſiam debere regi.*
5. Fifthly, That all true Miniſters of the Goſpel are of equal power and authority.

For the reaſon he aſſigns, why thoſe Churches ſhould make this Option;

on; we cannot enough admire that such a passion should fall from his pen, as to say, There is *little difference between their* Presbytery, *and our Episcopacy, save only in perpetuity and lay-Elders*; for who knows not that between these two there is as vast a difference, as between the *Duke of Venice*, and an *absolute Monarch*. For, 1. The Moderator in *Geneva* is not of a superior order to his brethren; Nor 2. Hath an Ordination differing from them; nor 3. Assumes power of sole Ordination or Jurisdiction; nor hath he 4. maintenance for that office above his Brethren; nor 5. a negative voice in what is agreed by the rest; nor 6. any further power than any of his Brethren. So that the difference between our Bishops and their Moderators is more than *little*: But if it be so little as this *Remonstrant* here pretends, then the *alteration* and *abrogation* of *Episcopacy* will be with the less *difficulty*, and *occasion the less disturbance*.

SECT. XV.

BUT there is another thing, wherein our *Episcopacy differs* from the *Geneva Moderatorship*, besides the perpetuity; and that is the *exclusion of the Lay-Presbytery*, which (if we may believe this *Remonstrant*) *never till this age had footing in the Christian Church*.

In which assertion, this *Remonstrant* concludes *so fully*, with Bishop *Halls irrefragable Propositions*, and his other Book of *Episcopacy by Divine right*, as if he had conspired to swear to what the Bishop had said.

Now, though we will not enter the Lists with a man of that *learning* and *fame*, that Bishop *Hall* is, yet we dare tell this *Remonstrant*, that this his assertion hath no more truth in it, *than the rest that we have already noted*. We will (to avoid prolixity) not urge those * three known Texts of Scripture, produced by some for the establishing of Governing Elders in the Church, *not yet vindicated by the Adversaries*.

* 1 Tim. 5. 17. 1 Cor. 12. 28. Ro. 12. 8.

Nor will we urge that famous Text of * *Ambrose* in 1 *Tim.* 5.

* *Unde & Synagogæ, & postea*

Ecclesiæ seniores habuit quorum sine consilio nihil agebatur in Eccl esiâ. Quod quâ negligentia obsolverit nescio, nisi forte Doctorum desidiâ, aut magis superbiâ, dum soli volunt aliquid videri. Origen Lib. 3. *contra Celsum.*

But if there were no *Lay-Elders* in the Church till this present age, we would be glad to learn, who they were of whom *Origen* speaks, when he tells us, it was the custom of Christian Teachers, first, to examine such as desired to hear them, of whom there were *two orders*; the first were *Catecumeni*, or beginners; the other was of such as were more perfect: among whom εἰσί τινες τεταγμένοι πρὸς τὸ φιλοπυθεῖν τὸν βίον καὶ τὰς ὁρμὰς τῶν προσώπων, &c. *Nonnulli præpositi sunt qui in vitam & mores eorum qui admittuntur inquiram, ut qui turpia committant eos communi Catu interdicant, qui verò ab istis abhorrent, ex animo complexi, meliores quotidie reddant;*

dam: There are ſome ordained to enquire into the life and manners of ſuch as are admitted into the Church, that they may baniſh ſuch from the publick Aſſembly, that perpetrate ſcandalous acts; which place tells us plainly:

Firſt, That there were ſome in the higher form of hearers (not Teachers) who were *Cenſores morum* over the reſt.

Secondly, That they were deſigned or conſtituted to this work, πλαγμένοι.

Thirdly, That they had ſuch authority intruſted into their hands, as that they might interdict ſuch as were ſcandalous from the publick Aſſemblies. We would gladly know, whether theſe were not, as it were *Lay-Elders.*

Fp. 137. That there were ſuch in the Church (diſtinguiſhed from others that were called to teach) appears. *Auguſtine* writing to his Charge, directs his Epiſtle, *Dilectiſſimis fratribus, Clero, Senioribus, & univerſæ Plebi Eccleſiæ Hipponenſis:* where firſt ther is the general compellation, *Fratribus*, Brethren; Then there is a diſtribution of theſe Brethren into the *Clergy*, the *Elders*, and the *whole people*; ſo that there were in that Church, *Elders* diſtinguiſhed both from the Clergy, and the reſt of the People.

So again, *Contra Creſconium Grammaticum: Omnes vos Epiſcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, & Seniores ſcitis*; *All you Biſhops, Elders, Deacons*, and
L 3. c. 1. *Elders* do know. What were thoſe two ſorts of Elders there mentioned in one *comma*? *and ibidem cap. 56. Peregrinus Presbyter & Seniores Eccleſiæ Muſticanæ Regionis tale deſiderium proſequuntur*; where again we read of *Elder* and *Elders, Presbyter and Seniors* in one Church.

Both theſe paſſages are upon record in the publick acts, which are more fully ſet down by *Baronius, Anno* 303. *Numb.* 15, 16, 17. As alſo by *Albaſpineus*, in his Edition of *Optatus*: in which Acts the *Seniors* are often mentioned. In that famous relation of the purging of *Cæcilianus* and *Felix*, there is a Copy of a Letter; *Fratribus & filiis: Clero & Senioribus, Fratribus in Domino æternam ſalutem:* Another Letter is mentioned a little before; *Clericis & Senioribus Carthenſium in Domino æternam ſalutem.* Theſe Seniors were intereſſed in affairs concerning the Church as being the men, by whoſe advice they were managed.

The Letter of *Purpurius* to *Silvanus* ſaith, *Adhibete conclericos, & ſeniores plebis, Eccleſiaſticos viros, & inquirant quæ ſint iſtæ diſſentiones: ut ea quæ ſunt ſecundum fidei Præcepta fiant.* Where we ſee the joynt power of theſe Seniors with the Clergy in ordering Eccleſiaſtical affairs; that by their wiſdom and care peace might be ſetled in the Church; for which cauſe theſe *Seniors* are called *Eccleſiaſtical men*; and yet they are diſtinguiſhed from *Clergy men.*

They are mentioned again afterwards by *Maximus*, ſaying *Loquor nomine SENIORUM Populi Chriſtiani. Greg. Mag.* diſtinguiſheth them alſo

alſo from the Clergy: *Tabellarium cum conſenſu SENIORUM & Cleri meminiſſe Ordinandum.*

Theſe Seniors had power to reprove offenders, otherwiſe why ſhould *Auguſtine* ſay, *Cum ob errorem aliquem a Senioribus arguuntur, & impunitatur alicui cur ebrius fuerit, cur res alienas pervacerit*, &c. when they were reproved by the Elders for their *errours*, and drunkenneſſe is laid to a mans charge, &c. So that it was proper to the Seniors to have the cognizance of Delinquents, and to reprove them.

Aug. Serm. 19. de Verb. Dom.

The ſame *Auguſtine* in *Pſalm* 36. *Neceſſe nos fuerat Primiani cauſam, Auguſtquem, &c. Seniorum literis ejuſdem Eccleſiæ poſtulantibus audire.* Being requeſted by Letters from the *Seniors* of that *Church*, it was needful for me to hear the cauſe of *Primian, &c.*

Auguſt. in Pſal. 38 Conc. 2.

So again, *Optatus*, who mentioning a perſecution that did for a while ſcatter the Church, ſaith, *Erant Eccleſiæ ex auro & argento quam plurima Ornamenta, quæ nec defodere terræ, nec ſecum portare poterat, quare fidelibus Senioribus commendavit. Albaſpineus*, that learned Antiquary on that place acknowledges, that *Beſide, the Clergy there were certain of the Elders of the people, men of approved life, that did tend the affaires of the Church, of whom this place is to be underſtood.*

By all theſe teſtimonies it is apparent: firſt, that in the ancient Church there were ſome called *Seniors*. Secondly, that theſe *Seniors* were not Clergy men. Thirdly, that they had a ſtroake in governing the Church, and managing the affairs thereof. Fourthly, that *Seniors* were diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the people.

Neither *would we deſire to chuſe any other Judges in this whole controverſie*; then whom himſelfe conſtituted; Forreign Divines, taking the General Suffrage and practice of the Churches, and not of particular men. *Pag.* 32.

As for the learned *Spanhemius* whom he produceth, though we give him the deſerved honour of a worthy man: yet we think it too much to ſpeak of him, as if the judgment of the whole *Church of Geneva* were incorporated into him, as this Remonſtrant doth. And for *Spanhemius* himſelf, we may truly ſay, in the place cited, he delivered a *complement*, rather then his *judgement*, which in *Dedicatory Epiſtles* is not unuſual. We know that reverend *Calvin* and learned *Beza* have ſaid as much upon occaſion in their Epiſtles, and yet the Chriſtian world knowes their Judgement was to the contrary.

Little reaſon therefore hath this Remonſtrant, to declaim againſt all ſuch as ſpeak againſt this Government as unlawful, with the *terms of ignorant and ſpiteful Sectaries*, becauſe they call the Government unlawful: had they proceeded further to call it Antichriſtian, (which he charges upon them) they had ſaid no more, then what our ears have heard ſome of their *principal* Agents, their *Legati a Latere* ſpeak publickly in their *viſitations*: *That however the Church of* England *be as ſound and Orthodox in their Doctrine as any Church in the World, yet in our Diſci-*

Pag. 33. *Pag.* 33. *Doct. Duck.*

pline and Government we are the same with the Church of Rome, which amounts to as much as to say the *Government is Antichristian*, unlesse the will say the Government of *Rome* is not so, nor the Pope Antichrist.

SECT. XVI.

NOw our *Remonstrant* begins to leave his dispute for the *Office*, and flowes into the large praises of the *Persons*, and what is wanting in his *Arguments* for the *Place*, thinks to make up in his *Encomyasticks* of the *Persons*, that have possest that place in the *Church of God*: and tells us, that *the Religious Bishops of all times are and have been they that have strongly upheld the truth of God against Satan and his Antichrist*. It is well he sets this Crown only upon the heads of *Religious Bishops*, as knowing that there are and have been some *Irreligious ones*, that have *as strongly upheld Satan and his Antichrist against the truth of God*. But *the Religious Bishops are they that have all times upheld the truth*? What? *they*? and *only they*? did never any uphold the truth, but a *Religious Bishop*? did never any Religious *Minister or Professor preach*, or *write*, or *dye*, to uphold the truth, but a *Religious Bishop*? if so, then there is some perswasive strength in that he saith; and a credulous man might be induced to think *If Bishops go down, truth will go down too*: But if we can produce for *one Bishop many others* that have been valliant for the truth, this Rhetorical insinuation will contribute no great help to their establishment. Nor indeed any at all; unlesse he were able to make this good *of our times*, as well as of all others, which he assaies; for saith he, *Even amongst our own, how many of the reverend and learned Fathers of the Church now living, have spent their spirits and worne out their lives in the powerful opposition of that man of sin*? how many? Sir, we would fain know how many: that there are *some* that have stood up to bear witnesse against that *Man of sin*, we acknowledg with all due respect, to the Learning and worth of their Persons; But that their Episcopal dignity hath added either any *flame to their zeal, or any Nerves to their ability*, we cannot believe, nor can we think they would have done lesse in that cause, though they had been no Bishops.

But what if this be true of some Bishops in the Kingdom, is it true of all? are there not some that have spent their spirits in the *opposition of Christ* as others have in the opposition of antichrist: and are those none but *Zealous, Religious Prelates* in the kingdom? *are there none upon whom the guilt of that may meritoriously be charged, which others have convincingly and meritoriously opposed*? And are there not some Bishops in the Kingdom, that are so far from opposing the *Man of sin*, that even this *Remonstrant* is in danger of suffering under the name of *Puritan* for daring to call

Pag. 34.

Pag. 35. *We may rather think that they would have don more Remembring what Martinus was wont to say to his friend Sulpitius, Neque quam sibi in Episcopatu eam virtutum Gratiam suppetisse, quam primus se habuisse meminisset. Sulpitius Severus Dial. 2.*

Pag. 35.

call him by that name? we doubt not but this *Remonſtrant* knowes there are.

But if he will againſt the light of his own Conſcience, bear up a known error out of private reſpects, (we will not ſay theſe papers) but his own Conſcience, ſhall one day be an evidence againſt him before the dreadful Tribunal of the Almighty. pag. 35.

But there is yet a ſecond thing that ſhould endear *Epiſcopacy, and that is the carefull, peaceable, painful, conſcionable managing of their Charges; to the great glory of God, and the comfort of his faithful people.* Which (in not ſeeming to urge) he urgeth to the full and beyond. This care, conſcience, pains of our Biſhops is exerciſed and evidenced, either in their preaching, or in their ruling; for their preaching, it is true, ſome few there are that *Labour in the Word and Doctrine*; whoſe *perſons* in that reſpect we *Honour*: but the moſt are ſo far from preaching, that they rather diſcountenance, diſcourage, oppoſe, blaſpheme preaching. pag. 35.

It was a *Non-preaching Biſhop*, that ſaid of a *Preaching Biſhop he was a preaching Cox-comb.* As for the diſcharge of their office of ruling, their entruſting their *Chancellors*, and other officers with their viſitations, and Courts (as ordinarily they do, whilſt themſelves attend the Court) doth abundantly witneſſe their *care in it.* The many and loud cries of the intolerable *oppreſſions* and *tyrannies* of their Court-proceeding; witneſſe *their peaceableneſſe* their unjuſt fees, and exactions, commutations; witneſſe *their conſcionableneſſe in managing their charges, to the great glory of God, and the comfort of his faithful people.*

And hence it is that ſo many at this day hear ill (how deſervedly, ſaith this Remonſtrant, God knowes;) and do not your Honours know, and doth not this Remonſtrant know? and doth not all the Nation (that will know any thing) know how deſervedy *Some*, nay, *Moſt*, nay, *All the Biſhops of the Nation* hear ill, were it but onely for the late Canons, and Oath? *But why ſhould the faults of ſome, diffuſe the blame to all?* Why? by your own argument, that would *extend the deſerts of ſome* to the *patronage of All*; and if it be a *fault in the impetuous and undiſtinguiſhing Vulgar, ſo to involve all, as to make innocency it ſelf a ſin*; what is it in a Man *able to diſtinguiſh*, by the *ſame implication*, to ſhrowd *ſin under Innocency*, the ſin of many under the *Innocency* of a *few*? pa. 36. pag. 36.

But have our Biſhops *indeed* been ſo *careful, painful, conſcionable*, in managing their Charges? how is it then that there are ſuch manifold *ſcandals of the inferiour Clergy* preſented to your *Honours view*, which he cannot *mention without a bleeding heart*; and could yet find in his heart (if he knew how) to excuſe them? and though he confeſſe them to be the *ſhame and miſery of the Church*, yet is he not aſhamed to plead their cauſe at your Honours BARRE, *Onuphrius*-like, that was the *Advocate of every bad cauſe*; and to excite you by *Conſtantines* example (in a different cauſe alledged) if not to ſuffer thoſe crimes, which himſelf calls hateful, to paſs pag. 37.

unpuniſhed, yet not to bring them to that *open and publick puniſhment* they have deſerved.

But what, if pious *Conſtantine* (in his tender care to prevent the Diviſions, that the emulation of the Biſhops of that age, enraged with a ſpirit of envy and faction, were kindling in the Church, leſt by that means the Chriſtian Faith ſhould be deriſed among the Heathans) did ſuppreſſe their mutual accuſations, many of which might be but upon ſurmiſes; and not in a *Court of Juſtice*, but in an *Eccleſiaſtical Synod*; ſhall this be urged before the higheſt *Court of Judgement upon earth*, to the Patronizing of *Notorious ſcandals and hateful enormities*, that are already proved by evidence of clear witneſſe?

But oh forbid to tell it in Gath, &c. What, the ſin? alaſs? that is done already; Do we not know, the Drunkenneſſe, Profaneneſſe, ſuperſtition, Popiſhneſs of the Engliſh Clergy rings at *Rome* already? yes undoubtedly; and there is no way to vindicate the Honour of our *Nation*, *Miniſtry*, *Parliaments*, *Sovereign*, *Religion*, *God*; but by cauſing the puniſhment to ring as far as the ſin hath done; that our adverſaries that have triumphed in their ſin, may be confounded at their puniſhment. Do not your *Honours* know, that the plaſtring or palliating of theſe rotten members, will be a greater diſhonour to the Nation and Church, then their cutting off; and that the perſonal acts of theſe *Sons of Belial*, being connived at, become National ſins?

But for this one fact of *Conſtantine*, we humbly crave your *Honours* leave to preſent to your wiſdom three Texts of Scripture, *Ezek.* 44. 12, 13. *Becauſe they miniſtred unto them before their Idols and cauſed the houſe of Iſrael to fall into iniquity, therefore have I lift up my hand unto them, ſaith the Lord, and they ſhall bear their iniquity. And they ſhall not come near unto me, to do the Office of a Prieſt unto me, nor to come near to any of mine holy things in the moſt holy place, &c.*

The ſecond is, *Jerem.* 48. 10. *Curſed be he that doth the work of the Lord negligently*: and the third is, *Judges*, 6. 31. *He that will plead for Baal, let him be put to death whilſt it is yet morning.* We have no more to ſay in this; whether it be beſt to walk after the *Precedent of Man*, or the *preſcript of God*, your *Honours* can eaſily judge.

SECT XVII.

Pag. 39. * In his preface to his Book called, *The way to the true* Church. *Solinus.*

BUT *ſtay*, ſaith this *Remonſtrant*; and indeed he might well have ſtayed and ſpared the labour of his enſuing diſcourſe, about the Church of *ENGLAND*, the *Prelatical* and the *Antiprelatical* Church: but theſe Epiſcopal Men deal as the *Papiſts* that dazel the eyes and aſtoniſh the ſenſes of poor people, with the glorious name of the Church, the *Church*; *The holy Mother the Church.* This is the *Gorgons head*, as Doctor * *White* ſaith

ſaith, that hath inchanted them, and held them in bondage to their Errours, All their ſpeech is of the *Church*, the *Church*; no mention of the *Scriptures*, *of God the Father*; but all of the *Mother the Church*. Much like as they write of certain *Æthyopians*, that by reaſon they uſe no marriage, but promiſcuouſly company together, the Children only follow the *Mother*, the *Father* and his name is in no requeſt, but the Mother hath all the reputation. So it is with the Author of this *Remonſtrance*, he ſtiles himſelf, *A Dutiful Son of the Church*. And it hath been a Cuſtome of late times to cry up the holy *Mother the Church of England*, to call for abſolute obedience to *holy Church*; full conformity to the orders of *holy Church*; Neglecting in the mean time *God the Father*, *and the holy Scriptures*.

But if we ſhould now demand of them, what they mean by the *Church of England*? this *Author* ſeems to be Thunder-ſtricken at this Queſtion; and calls the very *Queſtion*, *a New Divinity*; where he deals like ſuch as holding great revenues by unjuſt titles, will not ſuffer their Titles to be called in Queſtion. pag. 39.

For it is apparent, *Ac ſi ſolaribus radiis deſcriptum eſſet* (to uſe *Tertullians* phraſe) that the word *Church* is an *Equivocal word*, and hath as many ſeveral acceptions as letters; and that *Dolus latet in univerſalibus*; And that by the Church of *England*; firſt by ſome of theſe men is meant only the *Biſhops*; or rather the two *Archbiſhops*; or more properly the *Archbiſhop of Canterbury*; Juſt as the *Jeſuited Papiſts* reſolve the Church and all the glorious Titles of it into the *Pope*; ſo do theſe into the *Archbiſhop*, or at fulleſt, they underſtand it of *the Biſhops and their party met in Convocation*; as the more ingenious Papiſts make the *Pope and his Cardinals* to be *their Church*: thus excluding all the *Chriſtian people and Presbyters of the Kingdoms*, as not worthy to be reckoned in the number of the Church.

And which is more ſtrange, this *Author* in his *Simplicity* (as he truly ſaith) *never heard*, *nor thought of any more* Churches *of* England *then one*; and what then ſhall become of his *Dioceſan Churches*, and *Dioceſan Biſhops*? And what ſhall we think of *England*, when it was an *Heptarchy*? had it not then ſeven Churches, when ſeven Kings? or if the *Bounds of a Kingdom* muſt conſtitute the *Limits and Bounds of a Church*, why are not *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland*, all *one Church*? when they are happily united under one *gratious Monarch*, into one Kingdom? We read in Scripture of the Churches of *Judea*, and the Churches of *Galatia*: and why not the Churches of *England*? not that we deny the *Conſociation* or *Combination* of Churches into a Provincial or National Synod for the right ordering of them. But that there ſhould be no *Church in Eng.* but a *National Church*: this is that which *this Author* in his *ſimplicity* affirmes, of which the very rehearſall is a refutation.

SECT.

SECT. XVIII.

THere are yet two things with which this *Remonſtrance* ſhuts up it ſelf, which muſt not be paſt without our Obelisks.

Firſt, he ſcoffes at the *Antiprelaticall Church*, and the *Antiprelaticall Diviſions*; for our parts, we acknowledg no *Antiprelatical Church*. But there are a company of men in the *Kingdom, of no mean Ranck, or quality, for Piety, Nobility, Learning*, that ſtand up to bear witneſſe againſt the *Hierarchy* (as now it ſtands:) their uſurpation over Gods Church and Miniſters, their cruel uſing of Gods people by their tyranical government, this we acknowledg: and if he call theſe the *Antiprelatical Church*, we doubt not but that your Honours will conſider, that there are many thouſands in this Kingdom, and thoſe pious and worthy perſons, that thus do, and upon moſt juſt cauſe.

It was a ſpeech of *Eraſmus* of *Luther*, *Ut quiſque vir eſt optimus, Ita illius Scriptis minime offendi*; The better any man was, the leſſe offence he took at *Luthers* Writings: but we may ſay the contrary of the Prelats, *Ut quiſque vir eſt optimus, ita illorum factis magis offendi*; The better any man is, the more he is offended at their dealings. And all that can be objected againſt this party, will be like that in *Tertullian. Bonus vir Cajus Sejus, ſed malus tantum, quia Antiprelaticus*, But he upbraids us with our *Diviſions* & *Subdiviſions*, ſo do the Papiſts upbraid the Proteſtants with their *Lutheraniſme, Calviniſme*, and *Zuingliæniſme*. And this is that the Heathens objected to the Chriſtians, their fractures were ſo many, they knew not which Religion to chuſe if they ſhould turn Chriſtians: And can it be expected that the Church in any age ſhould be free from Diviſions, when the times of the Apoſtles were not free? and the Apoſtle tells us, *It muſt needs be that there be diviſions:* in *Greg. Naz.* daies there were 600. Errours in the Church; do theſe any way derogate from the truth and worth of Chriſtian Religion?

Tertull. adverſus Gent.

But as for the Diviſions of the Antiprelaticall party, ſo odiouſly exaggerated by this Remonſtrant: Let us aſſure your Honours, they have been much fomented by the *Prelates*, whoſe practice have been according to that rule of *Machiavil*: *Divide & impera*, and they have made theſe diviſions, and afterwards complain'd of that which their Tyranny and Policy hath made. It is no wonder, conſidering the paths our Prelates have trod, that there are diviſions in the Nation. The wonder is our diviſions are no more, no greater; and we doubt not but if they were of that gracious Spirit, and ſo intirely affected to the peace of the Church, as *Greg. Naz.* was, they would ſay as he did in the tumults of the people, *Mitte nos in mare, & non erit tempeſtas*; rather then they would hinder that ſweet Concordance, and conſpiration of mind unto a Government that

ſhall

ſhall be every way agreeable to the rule of Gods Word, and profitable for the edification of the Church.

A ſecond thing we cannot but take notice of, is the pains this *Author* takes to advance his *Prelatical Church*: and forgetting what he hath ſaid in the beginning: *That this party was ſo numerous*, it could not be ſummed; tells us now, *theſe ſeveral thouſands are punctually calculated.* But we doubt not but your Honours will conſider that there may be *multi homines, & pauci viri*; and there are more againſt them then for them. pag. 2. pag. 41.

And whereas they pretend, that they differ from us only in a Ceremony or an Organ-pipe, (which however is no contemptible difference) yet it will appear that our differences are in point of a ſuperiour allay. Though this Remonſtrant braves it in his multiplied Queries. *What are the bounds of this Church? what the diſtinction of the profeſſors and Religion?* what grounds of Faith? what new Creed do they hold different from their Neighbours? what Scriptures? what Baptiſm? what means of Salvation other then the reſt? yet if he pleaſed he might have ſilenced his own Queries: but if he will needs put us to the anſwer, we wil reſolve them one by one. pag. 41.

Firſt, if he ask what are the bounds of this Church? we anſwer him out of the ſixt of their late founded Cannons: where we find the limits of this Prelatical Church extends as far as from the high and lofty Promontory of Archbiſhops, to the *Terra incognita* of an, &c.

If what *Diſtinction of profeſſors and Religion*; we anſwer, their worſhipping towards the Eaſt, and bowing towards the Altar, proſtrating themſelves in their approaches into Churches, placing all Religion in outward formalities, are viſible differences of theſe profeſſors and their Religion.

If what new Creed they have, or what grounds of faith differing from their Neighbours? we anſwer, Epiſcopacy by divine right is the firſt Article of their Creed; Abſolute and blind obedience to all the Commandments of the Church, (that is, the Biſhop and his Emiſaries) election upon faith foreſeen, the influence of works into *Juſtification*, falling from grace, &c.

If what Scripture? we anſwer, the Apochrypha, and unwritten Traditions.

If what Baptiſm? a Baptiſm of abſolute Neceſſity unto ſalvation; and yet unſufficient unto ſalvation; as not ſealing grace to the taking away of ſin after Baptiſm.

If what Euchariſt? an Euchariſt that muſt be adminiſtred upon an Altar or a Table ſet Altar-wiſe, railed in, an Euchariſt, in which there is ſuch a preſence of Chriſt, (though *Modum neſciunt*) as makes the place of its Adminiſtration the *throne of God*, the place of the *Reſidence of the Almighty*; and impreſſeth ſuch a holineſſe upon it as makes it not only capable, but worthy of adoration.

If

If what Christ? a *Christ* who hath given the same power of absolution to a Priest that himself hath.

If what Heaven? a Heaven that hath a broad way leading thither, and is receptive of Drunkards, Swearers, and Adulterers, &c. such a heaven as we may say of it, as the *Indians* said of the heaven of the *Spaniards:* Unto that heaven which some of the *prelatical Church* living and dying in their *scandalous* sins, and hateful Enormities go to, let our Souls never enter.

If what means of Salvation? we answer, confession of sins to a Priest, as the most absolute, undoubted, necessary, infallible means of Salvation.

pag. 41. Far be it from us to say with this *Remonstrant*, We do fully agree in all these, and all other Doctrinal, and Practical points of Religion, and preach one and the same saving truths. Nay, we must rather say as that holy Martyr did, *we thank God we are* none of you.

pag. 42. Nor do we because of this dissension, fear the censure of uncharitableness from any but uncharitable men. But it is no unusual thing with the Prelates and their party, to charge such as protest against their corrupt opinions and waies, with uncharitableness and Schism, as the Papists do the *Protestants:* and as the *Protestants* do justly recriminate, and charge that Schism upon the Papists, which they object to us: So may we upon the Prelates: And if *Austin* may be judge, the Prelates are more Schismaticks then we. *Quicunque* (saith he) *invident bonis, ut quærunt occasiones excludendi eos, aut degradandi, vel crimina sua sic defendere parati sunt (si objecta vel prodita fuerint) ut etiam conventiculorum congregationes vel Ecclesiæ perturbationes cogitent excitare, jam schismatici sunt.* Whosoever envy those that are good, and seek occasions to exclude and degrade them, and are so ready to defend their faults, that rather then they will leave them, they will devise how to raise up troubles in the *Church* and drive men into conventicles and corners, they are the Schismaticks.

And that all the world may take notice what just cause we have to complain of Episcopacy, as now it stands, we humbly crave leave to propound these *Queries.*

Queries about Episcopacy.

WHether it be tolerable in a *Christian Church*, that Lord Bishops should be held to be *Jure Divino*; And yet the Lords day by some men to be but *Jure Humano*? And that the same person should cry up *Altars* instead of *Communion-Tables*, and *Priests* instead of *Ministers*, and yet not *Judaize*, when they will not suffer the Lords day to be called the Sabbath-day, for fear of *Judaizing*? Whereas the word *Sabbath* is a general word, signifying a day of rest, which is common as well to the Christian Sabbath, as to the Jewish Sabbath, and was also used by the Ancients, *Ruffinus in Psal.* 47. *Origen. Hom.* 23. *in Num. Gregory Nazian.*

Whether

Whether that assertion, No Bishop, No King; and no Ceremony, no Bishop; be not very prejudicial to the Kingly Authority? For it seems to imply, that the civill power depends upon the spiritual, and is supported by Ceremonies and Bishops. 2.

Whether seeing it hath been proved, that Bishops (as they are now asserted) are a meer humane Ordinance, it may not by the same authority be abrogated by which it was first established: especially, considering the long experience of the hurt they have done to Church and State? 3.

Whether the advancing of Episcopacie into *Jus Divinum*, doth not make it a thing simply unlawful to submit to that Government? Because that many conscientious men that have hitherto conformed to Ceremonies and Episcopacy, have done it upon this ground, as supposing that Authority did not make them matters of worship, but of order and Decencie, &c.] And thus they satisfie their consciences in answering those Texts, *Colos*, 2. 20, 21, 22. *Mat.* 15. 9. But now since Episcopacy comes to be challenged as a Divine Ordinance, how shall we be responsible to those *Texts*? And is it not as it is now asserted, become an Idol, and like the *Brazen Serpent* to be ground to powder? 4.

Whether there be any difference in the point of *Episcopacy* between *Jus Divinum* and *Jus Apostolicum*? Because we find some claiming their standing by *Jus divinum*; others by *Jus Apostolicum*. But we conceive that *Jus Apostolicum* properly taken, is all one with *Jus Divinum*. For *Jus Apostolicum* is such a *Jus*, which is founded upon the *Acts* and *Epistles* of the Apostles, written by them so as to be a perpetual Rule for the succeeding *Administration* of the *Church*, as this *Author* saith, *Pag.* 20. And this *Jus* is *Jus Divinum*, as well as *Apostolicum*. But if by *Jus Apostolicum* they mean improperly (as some do) such things which are not recorded in the writings of the *Apostles*, but introduced, the *Apostles* being living, they cannot be rightly said to be *Jure Apostolico*, nor such things which the *Apostles* did intend the *Churches* should be bound unto. Neither is *Episcopacy* as it imports a superiority of power over a *Presbyter*, no not in this sense *Jure Apostolico*, as hath been already proved, and might further be manifested by divers Testimonies, if need did require. We will only instance in *Cassander* a man famous for his immoderate moderation in controverted Points of *Religion*, who in his *Consultat. Article* 14. hath this saying, *An Episcopatus inter ordines Ecclesiasticos ponendus sit, inter Theologos & Canonistas non convenit; Convenit autem inter omnes, Apostolorum ætate inter Presbyterum & Episcopum nullum discrimen fuisse, &c.* 5.

Whether the distinction of *Beza*, between *Episcopus Divinus, Humanus & Diabolicus*, be not worthy your honours consideration? By the Divine *Bishop*, he means the *Bishop* as he is taken in Scripture, which is one and the same with the *Presbyter*: By the humane *Bishop* he means the *Bishop* chosen by the *Presbyters* to be President over them, and to rule with them by fixed *Laws* and *Canons*. By the *Diabolical Bishop*, he means a *Bishop* 6.

with ſole power of Ordination and Juriſdiction, Lording it over Gods heritage, and governing by his own will and authority. Which pursus in mind of the Painter that Limned two pictures to the ſame proportion and figure; The one he reſerved in ſecret, the other he expoſed to common view, And as the phanſie of beholders led them to cenſure any line or proportion, as not done to the life, he mends it after direction: If any fault be found with the eye, hand, foot, &c. He corrects it, till at laſt the addition of every mans fanſie had defaced the firſt figure, and made that which was the Picture of a man, ſwell into a monſter: Then bringing forth this, and his other Picture which he had reſerved, he preſented both to the People: And they abhorring the former, and applauding the latter, he cryed, *Hunc populus fecit*: This deformed one the people made: This lovely one I made. As the Painter of his painting, ſo (in *Beza's* ſenſe) it may be ſaid of Biſhops, God at firſt inſtituted Biſhops, ſuch as are all one with Presbyters, ; and ſuch are amiable, honourable in all the Churches of God: But when men would be adding to Gods inſtitution, what power, preheminence, Juriſdiction, Lordlineſſe their phanſie ſuggeſted unto them, this divine Biſhop loſt his Original beauty, and became to be *Humanus*; And in concluſion (by theſe and other additions ſwelling into a Pope) *Diabolicus*.

Hunc populus fecit.

7. Whether the Ancient Fathers, when they call *Peter, Mark, James Timothy, and Titus* Biſhops, did not ſpeak according to the Language of the times wherein they lived, rather then according to the true acceptation of the word Biſhop? and whether it be not true which is here ſaid in this Book, that they are called Biſhops of *Alexandria, Epheſus, Jeruſalem, &c.* in a very improper ſenſe, becauſe they abode at thoſe places a longer time, then at other places? For ſure it is, if Chriſt made *Peter* and *James* Apoſtles, (which are Biſhops over the whole world (and the Apoſtles made *Mark, Timothy* and *Titus* Evangeliſts, &c. it ſeems to us that it would have been a great ſin in them to limit themſelves to one particular Dioceſs, and to leave that calling in which Chriſt had placed them.

8. Whether Presbyters in Scripture are called προϊσταμένοι & προεστῶτες, & that it is an office, required at their hands, to rule and to govern, as hath been proved in this book: the Biſhops can without ſin arrogate the exerciſe of this power to themſelves alone, and why they may not with the ſame lawfulneſſe impropriate to themſelves alone, the Key of Doctrine (Which yet notwithſtanding all would condemn) as well as the Key of diſcipline, ſeeing that the whole power of the Keys is given to Presbyters in Scripture as well as to Biſhops; as appears *Mat.* 16. 19. where the power of the Keys is promiſed to *Peter*, in the name of the reſt of the Apoſtles, and their ſucceſſors; and given to all the Apoſtles, and their ſucceſſors, *Mat.* 18. 19. *John* 20. 23. And that Presbyters ſucceed the Apoſtles, appears not only, *Mat.* 28.20. but alſo *Acts* 20.28. where the Apoſtle ready to leave the Church of *Epheſus*, commends the care of ruling and feeding

feeding it to the Elders of the Church. To this *Irenaus* witnesseth, *lib* 4. *cap.* 43, 44. This Bishop *Jewel* against *Harding*, *Artic.* 4. *Sect.* 5, 6. saith, that all Pastors have equal power of binding and loosing with *Peter*.

Whether since that Bishops assume to themselves power temporal (to be Barons, and to sit in Parliament, as Judges, and in Court of Star-Chamber, High Commission, and other Courts of Justice) and also power spiritual over Ministers and People, to ordain, silence, suspend, deprive, excommunicate, &c. their spiritual power be not as dangerous (though both be dangerous) and as much to be opposed as their temporal? 1. Because the spiritual is over our consciences, the temporal but over our purses. 2. Because the spiritual have more influence into Gods Ordinances to defile them, then the temporal. 3. Because spiritual judgements and evils are greater then other. 4. Because the Pope was Antichrist, before he did assume any temporal power. 5. Because the spiritual is more inward and lesse discerned: and therefore it concerns all those that have Spiritual eyes, and desire to worship God in spirit and truth, to consider and indeavour to abrogate their spiritual usurpations as well as their temporal. 9.

10. Whether *Aerius* be justly branded by *Epiphanius* and *Austin* for a Heretick (as some report) for affirming Bishops and Presbyters to be of an equal power? 10.

We say, as some report, for the truth is, he is charged with heresie meerly and only because he was an *Arian*. As for his opinion of the parity of a Presbyter with a Bishop; this indeed is called by *Austin*, *proprium dogma Aerii*, the proper opinion of *Aerius*. And by *Epiphanius* it is called *dogma furiosum & stolidum*, a mad and foolish opinion, but not an heresie neither by the one nor the other. But let us suppose (as is commonly thought, that he was accounted an Heretick for this opinion: yet notwithstanding, that this was but the private opinion of *Epiphanius*, and borrowed out of him by *Austin*, and an opinion not to be allowed, appears,

First, because the same Authors condemn *Aerius*, as much for reprehending and censuring the mentioning of the dead in the publick prayers, and the performing of good works for the benefit of the dead. And also for the reprehending *stata jejunia*, and the keeping of the week before *Easter* as a solemn Fast; which if worthy of condemnation, would bring in most of the reformed Churches into the censure of Heresy.

Secondly, because not only Saint *Hierome*, but *Austin* himself, *Sedulius*, *Primasius*, *Chrysostom*, *Theodoret*, *Occumenius*, *Theophilact*, were of the same opinion with *Aerius* (as *Michael Medina* observes in the Councel of *Trent*, and hath written, *Lib.* 1. *de sacr. hom. origine*) and yet none of these deserving the name of fools, much lesse to be branded for Hereticks.

Thirdly, because no Councel did ever condemn this for Heresy, but on the contrary, *Consilium Aquisgranens. sub Ludovico Pio Imp.* 1. *anno* 816. hath approved it for true Divinity out of the Scripture, that Bishops and Presbyters are equal, bringing the same text that *Aerius* doth, and which

Epiphanius saith, he did *Aerium ipsum dogmatum novitate superare.* *Austin* saith in *Arrianorum haeresin lapsum Epiph.* accused him because he said that, *superstitum preces did not opitulari eis qui ex hac vita descesserint.* And *Austin* accused *Arrius* because he said, *non licet orare, vel offerre pro mortuis oblationem.*

Whitaker Respons. ad Campian. rat. 10. hath these words. Aerium Epiphan. & Augustinus in hæreticis numerant & preter eos anti quos pauci. Et si Presbyterum Episcopo æquare sa hæreticum, nihil Catholicum esse potest cum Aerio Hieronim. de Presbyteris omnino sensit illos enim jure divino Episcopis æquales esse statuit. Sozomon. hist. lib. 6. cap. 10.

Epiphanius indeed undertakes to answer; but how slightly let any indifferent Reader judge.

11. Whether the great *Apostasie* of the *Church* of *Rome* hath not been, in swerving from the Discipline of *Christ*, as well as from the doctrine? for so it seems by that Text, 2 *Thes.* 2. 4. And also, *Revel.* 18. 7. and divers others. And if so, then it much concerns all those that desire the purity of the *Church*, to consider, how neer the Discipline of the *Church* of *England* borders upon *Antichrist*; least while they indeavour to keep out *Antichrist* from entring by the door of *Doctrine*, they should suffer him secretly to creep in by the door of Discipline, especially considering, what is here said in this book, that by their own confession *the Discipline of the Church of England is the same with the Church of Rome.*

12. Whether *Episcopacy* be not made a place of dignity, rather then Duty, and desired only for the great revenues of the place? And whether, if the largeness of their revenues were taken away, *Bishops* would not decline the great burthen and charge of *Souls* necessarily annexed to their places, as much as the ancient *Bishops* did, who hid themselves, that they might not be made *Bishops*; and cut off their ears, rather then they would be made *Bishops*: whereas now *Bishops* cut off the ears of those that speak against their *Bishopricks*?

13. How it comes to, pass that in *England* there is such increase of *Popery*, *Superstition*, *Arminianism*, and *Prophanesse*, more then in other Reformed *Churches*? Doth not the root of these disorders proceed from the *Bishops* and their adherents, being forced to hold correspondencie with *Rome* to uphold their greatness, and their *Courts* and *Canons*, wherein they symbolize with *Rome*? And whether it be not to be feared, that they will rather consent to the bringing in of *Popery*, for the upholding of their dignities, than part with their dignities for the upholping of *Religion*?

14. Why should *England* that is one of the chiefest Kingdoms in *Europe*, that separates from *Antichrist*, maintain and defend a Discipline different from all other reformed *Churches*, which stand in the like Separation? And whether the continuance of this Discipline will not at last bring us to communion with *Rome*, from which we are separated, and to separation from the other *Reformed Churches*, unto which we are united?

15. Whether it be fit that the name *Bishop*, which in Scripture is common to the *Presbyters* with *Bishops*, (and not only in Scripture, but also in Antiquity for some hundreds of years) should still be appropriated to *Bishops* and ingrossed by them, and not rather to be made common to all Presbyters; and the rather because,

First, we find by woful experience, that the great equivocation that lieth in the name *Bishop*, hath been, and is at this day a great prop and pillar to uphold *Lordly Prelacy*; for this is the great *Goliah*, the Masterpiece, and indeed the only argument with which they think to silence all op-

opposers; to wit, the antiquity of *Episcopacy*, that it hath continued in the Church of Christ for 1500. years, &c. which argument is cited by this Remonstrant *ad nauseam usque & usque*. Now it is evident that this argumentis a *Paralogism*, depending upon the Equivocation of the name *Bishop*. For *Bishops* in the *Apostles* time were the same with the Presbyters in name and Office, and so for a good while after. And when afterwards they came to be distinguished, the *Bishops* of the Primitive times differed as much from ours now, as *Rome* ancient from *Rome* at this day, as hath been sufficiently declared in this book. And the best way to confute this argument is by bringing in a Community of the name *Bishop* to a Presbyter as well as to a *Bishop*.

Secondy, becaus we find that the late Innovators, which have so much disturbed the peace and purity of our Church, did first begin with the alteration of words; and by changing the word *Table* into the word *Altar*, and the word *Minister* into the word *Priest*, and the word *Sacrament* into the word *Sacrifice*, have indeavoured to bring in the *Popish Masse*. And the Apostle exhorts us, 2 *Tim*. 1. 13. *To hold fast the form of sound words*: and 1 *Tim*, 6. 20. *To avoid the prophane novelties of words*. Upon which text we will only mention what the Rhemists have commented, which we conceive to be worthy consideration; *Nam instruunt nos non solum docentes, sed etiam errantes*. The Church of God hath alwaies been as diligent to resist novelties of words, as her adversaries are busie to invent them, for which cause she will not have us communicate with them, nor follow their fashions and phrases newly invented, though in the nature of the words sometimes there be no harm. Let us keep our forefathers words, and we shall easily keep our old and true faith, that we had of the first Christians; let them say, *Amendment*, *Abstinence*, the *Lords Supper*, the *Communion-Table*, *Elders*, *Ministers*, *Super-intendent*, *Congregation*, *So be it*, *Praise ye the Lord*, *Morning Prayer*, *Evening prayer*, and the rest as they will; Let us avoid those novelties of words, according to the *Apostles* prescript, and keep the old terms, *Penance*, *Fast*, *Priest*, *Church*, *Bishop*, *Masse*, *Mattin*, *Even-song*, the *B. Sacrament*, *Altar*, *Oblation*, *Host*, *Sacrifice*, *Hallelujah*, *Amen*; *Lent*, *Palm-Sunday*, *Christmas*, and the words will bring us to the faith of our first *Apostles*, and condemn these new *Apostates*, new faith and phrase.

Whether having proved that God never set such a government in his Church as our Episcopal Government is, we may lawfully any longer be subject unto it, be present at their *Courts*, obey their *Injunctions*, and especially be instruments in publishing, and executing their *Excommunications* and *Absolutions*? *Qus*. 16

And thus we have given (as we hope) a sufficient answer, and as brief as the matter would permit, to the *Remonstrant*: With whom, though we agree not in opinion touching *Episcopacie* and *Liturgy*; yet we fully con-

consent with him to pray unto Almighty God, *Who is great in power, and infinite in wisdome, to powr downe upon the whole Honourable Assembly the spirit of wisdome and understanding, the spirit of Counsel and might, the spirit of Knowledge and of the fear of the Lord: That you may be able to discern betwixt things that differ, separate between the precious and the vile, purely purge away our drosse, and take away all our Tin, root out every plant that is not of our heavenly Fathers planting: That so you may raise up the foundations of many generations, and be called the Repairers of breaches, and Restorers of paths to dwel in.* Even so, *Amen.*

A POSTSCRIPT.

THough we might have added much light and beauty to our Discourse by inserting variety of Histories upon several occasions given us in the *Remonstrance*, the answer whereof we have undertaken; especially where it speaks of the *bounty* and *gratious munificence* of *Religious Princes* towards *Bishops*, yet unwilling to break the thred of our discourse, and its connection with the *Remonstrance* by so large a digression, as the whole *series* of History producible to our purpose, would extend unto: we have chosen rather to subjoin by way of *Appendix*, an historical Narration of those bitter fruits, *Pride*, *Rebellions*, *Treason*, *unthankfulnesse*, &c. which have issued from *Episcopacy*, whilst it hath stood under the continued influences of Sovereigne goodnesse. Which narration would fill a volume, but we will bound our selves upon the Stories of this Kingdome, and that revolution of time which hath passed over us since the erection of the *See of Canterbury*. And because in most things the beginning is observed to be a presage of that which followeth, let their Founder *Austin* the Monk come first to be considered: Whom we may justly account to have been such to the English, as the Arian Bishops were of old to the Goths, and the Jesuits now among the Indians, who of Pagans have made but Arians and Papists. His ignorance in the Gospel which he preached, is seen in his Idle and Judaical consultations with the Pope, about things clean and unclean; his proud demeanour towards the Brittish Clergy, appears in his Councel called about no solid point of faith, but celebration of Easter, where having troubled and threatned the Churches of *Wales*, and afterwards, of Scotland, about Romish Ceremonies, he is said in fine to have been the stirrer up of *Ethelbert*, by means of the Northumbrian King, to the slaughter of twelve hundred of those poor laborious Monks of *Bangor*. His Successors busied in nothing but urging and instituting Ceremonies and maintaining Precedency we passe over.

Beda. *Hollinsh.* *Speed.* *Hollinsh* out of *Capgra.* *Osborn.* *Higden.*

Till *Dunstan*, the Sainted Prelate, who of a frantick Necromancer, and suspected fornicator, was shorn a Monk, and afterwards made a Bishop. His worthy deeds are noted by *Speed*, to have been the cheating King *Eldred*

Eldred of the treasure committed to his keeping; the prohibiting of marriage, to the increasing of all filthinesse in the Clergy of those times? as the long oration of King *Edgar* in *Stow* well testifies.

In *Edward* the Confessors daies, *Robert* the *Norman* no sooner Archbishop of *Canterbury*, but setting the King and Earl *Godwine* at variance for private revenge, broach't a Civil War, till the Arch-bishop was banisht. *Edw. Conf. Holsh.* 191.

Now *William* the Conquerer had set up *Lanckefrancke* Bishop of *Canterbury*, who to requite him, spent his faithfull service to the Pope *Gregory*, in perswading the King to subject himself and his State to the Papacy as himselfe writes to the Pope. *Suasi sed non persuasi.* *Will. Conq. Speed p.* 442.

The treason of *Anselm* to *Rufus* was notorious, who not content to withstand the King obstinately in mony-matters, made suit to fetch his Pall or Investiture of Archiepiscopacy from *Rome*, which the King denying as flat against his Regal Sovereignty, he went without his leave, and for his Romish good service received great honour from the Pope, by being seated at his right foot in a Synod, with these words, *Includamus hunc in orbe nostro tanquam alterius orbis Papam.* Whence perhaps it is that the See of *Canterbury* hath affected a Patriarchy in our daies. This *Anselm* also condemned the married Clergy. *Wil. Ruf.*

Henry the first reigning, the same *Anselm* deprived those Prelates that had been invested by the King, and all the Kingdome is vext with one Prelate; who the second time betakes himself to his old fortresse at *Rome*, till the King was fain to yeeld. Which done, and the Archbishop returned, spends the rest of his daies in a long contention and unchristian jangling *with York*, about Primacy. Which ended not so, but grew hot between *York* and *London*, as Dean to *Canterbury*, striving for the upper seat at Dinner, till the King seeing their odious pride, put them both out of doors. *Hen.* 1. *Holshin.* 37.

To speak of *Ralph* and *Thurstan*, the next Archbishops pursuing the same quarrel, were tedious, as it was no small molestation to the King and Kingdom; *Thurstan* refusing to stand to the Kings Doom, and wins the day, or else the King must be accurs'd by the Pope; which further animates him to try the mastery with *William* next Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, and no man can end it but their Father the Pope; for which they travel to *Rome*. In the mean while, marriage is sharply decreed against. *Speed* 448. and the Legate *Cremonensis*, the Declaimer against matrimony taken with a Strumpet the same night. *Holinsh.* 38. *Holinsh.* 42, 43. *K. Step.*

In King *Stephens* Reign, the haughty Bishops of *Canterbury* and *Winchester* bandy about Precedency; and to *Rome* to end the Duel. *Theobald* goes to *Rome* against the Kings will; interdicts the Realm, and the King forc't to suffer it; till refusing to Crown *Eustace* the Kings Son, because the Pope had so commanded, he flies again. *Holinsh.* 57, 58, 59.

Becket's pride and outragious treasons are too manifest; resigning the *Hen.* 2.

Kings

Sp.462. Kings gift of his *Archbiſhoprick* to receive it of the *Pope*; requiring the
out of *Nubrigens.* Cuſtody of *Rocheſter-Caſtle*, and the Tower of *London*, as belonging to his *Seignorie.* Protects murthering Prieſts from temporal ſword; ſtanding ſtifly for the liberties and Dignities of Clerks, but little to chaſtiſe their vices, which beſides other crying ſins, were above a hundred murthers ſince *Henry* the Seconds crowning, till that time; to maintain which moſt of the *Biſhops* conſpire, till the terrour of the King made them ſhrink; but *Becket* obdures, denies that the King of *Englands* Courts have authority to judge him. And thus was this noble King diſquieted by an inſolent Traytor, in habit of a Biſhop, a great part of his Reign; the land in uproar; many Excommunicated and accurſed; *France* and *England* ſet to War, and the King himſelf curbed, and controled; and laſtly diſcipline by the *Biſhops* and *Monks*: firſt, with a bare-foot penance, that drew blood from his feet, and laſtly, with fourſcore laſhes on his anointed body with Rods.

Yet this mans life is lately Printed in engliſh as a thing to be imitated.

Hol.73.

Sp.469.

In the ſame Kings time it was that the Archbiſhop of *York* ſtriving to ſit above *Canterbury*, ſquats him down on his lap, whence with many a cuff he was thrown down.

Hol.98.

Rich. 1. Next the pride of *W. Longchamp*, Biſhop of *Elie*, was notorious, who
Pa.129. would ride with a thouſand horſe; and of a Governour in the Kings ab-
130. ſence, became a Tyrant; for which flying in womans apparrel he was taken.
132. To this ſucceeds contention between *Canterbury* and *York* about carriage of their Croſſes, and *Rome* appeal'd to: the Biſhop of *Durham* buyes an Earldom.

144. No ſooner another King, but *Hubert* another Archbiſhop to vex him,
K. Iohn and leſt that were not enough, made Chancellour of *England*. And beſides him *Jeffery* of *York*, who refuſing to pay a Subſidy within his precincts, and therefore all his temporalities ſeaſ'd; excommunicates the Sheriff, beates the Kings Officers, and interdicts his whole Province. *Hubert* outbraves the King in Chriſtmas houſe-keeping: hinders King *John* by his Legantine power from recovering *Normandy*. After him *Stephen Langton*,
Sp.503. ſet up by the Pope in ſpite of the King, who oppoſing ſuch an affront, fals under an interdict, with his whole Land; and at the ſuit of his Archbiſhop to the Pope, is depoſed by Papal Sentence; his Kingdom given to *Philip* the French King, *Langtons* friend; and laſtly, reſignes and enſends his Crown to the Pope.

Sp.509. After this tragical *Stephen*, the fray which *Boniface* the next Archbiſhop but one had with the Canons of St. *Bartholmews*, is as pleaſant: the tearing
Hen. 3. of Hoods and Cowls, the miring of Copes, the flying about of Wax Can-
St.188. dles and Cenſors in the ſcuffle, cannot be imagined without mirth; as his oathes were loud in this bickering, ſo his curſes were as vehement in the contention with the Biſhop of *Wincheſter* for a ſlight occaſion. But now
Ho.247 the Biſhops had turned their conteſting into baſe and ſervile flatteries, to advance themſelves on the ruine of the Subjects. For *Peter de Rupibus*
Biſhop

Biſhop of *Wincheſter* perſwading the King to diſplace *Engliſh* Officers, and ſubſtitute Poictivines, and telling the Lords to their faces, that there were no Peers in *England*, as in *France*, but that the King might do what he would, and by whom he would, became a fire-brand to the civill wars that followed. *Sp.* 526, 530.

In this time *Peckham Archbiſhop of Canterbury* in a Synod was tampering with the Kings liberties, but being threatned, deſiſted. But his ſucceſſor *Winchelſey* on occaſion of Subſidies demanded of the Clergy, made anſwer, That having two Lords, the one Spiritual, the other Temporal, he ought rather to obey the Spiritual governour the *Pope*, but he would ſend to the *Pope* to know his pleaſure, and ſo perſiſted even to beggery. The Biſhop of *Durham* alſo cited by the King flies to *Rome*. *Edw.* 1. *Ho.* 280 *Ho.* 301 *Ho.* 315

In the depoſing of this *King*, who more forward then the *Biſhop* of *Hereford*? witneſſe his Sermon at *Oxford*, *My head*, *my head aketh*, concluding that an aking and ſick head of a *King* was to be taken off without further Phyſick. *Edw.* 2. *Sp.* 574.

John the *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury*, ſuſpected to hinder the *Kings* glorious victories in *Flanders*, and *France*, by ſtopping the conveyance of moneys committed to his charge, conſpiring therein with the *Pope*. But not long after was conſtituted that fatall *præmunire*, which was the firſt nipping of their courage to ſeek aid at *Rome*. And next to that, the wide wounds that *Wickleffe* made in their ſides. From which time they have been falling, and thenceforth all the ſmoke that they could vomit, was turned againſt the riſing light of pure doctrine. *Edw.* 3. *Sp.* 586. *Ho.* 409

Yet could not their pride miſſe occaſion to ſet other miſchief on foot. For the Citizens of *London* riſing to apprehend a riotous ſervant of the *Biſhop* of *Salisbury*, then Lord Treaſurer, who with his fellowes ſtood on his guard in the *Biſhops* houſe, were by the *Biſhop*, who maintained the riot of his ſervant, ſo complained of, that the *King* therewith ſeiſed on their liberties, and ſet a Governour over the City. And who knowes not, that *Tho. Arundel Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury* was a chief inſtrument and agent in depoſing K. *Richard*, as his actions and Sermons well declares. *Rich.* 1. *Ho.* 478 *pa.* 506.

The like intended the Abbot of *Weſtminſter* to *Henry* the fourth, who for no other reaſon, but becauſe he ſuſpected that the *King* did not favour the wealth of the *Church*, drew into a moſt horrid conſpiracy the Earls of *Kent*, *Rutland* and *Salisbury*, to kill the *King* in a turnament at *Oxford*, who yet notwithſtanding was a man that profeſſed to leave the Church in better ſtate then he found it. For all this, ſoon is *Richard Scroop Archbiſhop* of *York* in the field againſt him, the chief attactor of the rebellious party. *Hen.* 4. *pa.* 514. *Sp.* 631. *Ho.* 529

In theſe times *Thomas Arundel* a great perſecutor of the Goſpel preached by *Wicklefs* followers, dies a fearful death, his tongue ſo ſwelling within his mouth, that he muſt of neceſſity ſtarve. His ſucceſſor *Chickeley* nothing milder diverts the *King*, that was looking too nearly into the ſuperfluous *Hen.* 5.

*Sp.*638. fluous revenues of the Church, to a bloody war.

All the famous conquests which *Henry* the fift had made in *France*, were
Hen. 5. lost by a civil dissention here in *England*, which sprang first from the haughty pride of *Beauford* Bishop and Cardinal of *Wincheſter*, and the Arch-
*Ho.*596 bishop of *York* against the Protector, *Speed* 674. In the civill Wars the
pa. 620. Archbishop sides with the Earl of *Warwick*, and *March in Kent*. *Speed* 682.

Edw. 4. *Edward* the 4th. *Mountacute* Archbishop of *York*, one of the chief con-
*Sp.*699. spirators with *Warwicke* against *Edward the* 4th. and afterwards his Jaylour, being by *Warwicks* treason committed to this Bishop.

Edw. 5. In *Edward* the fifths time the Archbishop of *York* was, though perhaps unwittingly (yet by a certain fate of Prelacy) the unhappy instrument of pulling the young Duke of *York* out of Sanctuary, into his cruell Uncles hands.

Rich. 3. Things being setled in such a peace, as after the bloody brawls was to the afflicted Realm howsoever acceptable, though not such as might be wished: *Morton* Bishop of *Ely*, enticing the Duke of *Buckingham* to take the Crown, which ruin'd him, opened the veins of the poor Subjects to bleed afresh.

Hen. 8. *Ho.*845 462. The intolerable pride, extortion, bribery, luxury of *Wolsey* Archbishop of *York*, who can be ignorant of? selling dispensations by his power Legantine for all offences, insulting over the Dukes and Peers, of whom some he brought to destruction by bloody policy, playing with State-affairs according to his humor, or benefit: causing *Tournay*, got with the blood of many a good Souldier, to be rendred at the *French Kings* secret request to him, not without bribes; with whom one while siding, another while with the Emperour, he sould the honour and peace of *England* at what rates he pleased; and other crimes to be seen in the *Articles* against him, *Holi.* 912. and against all the Bishops in general, 911. which when the Parliament sought to remedy, being most excessive extortion in the Ecclesiasticall Courts, the Bishops cry out, *Sacriledg*, the Church goes to ruine, as it did in *Bohemia*, with the schism of the *Hussites*, *Ibid.* After this, though the
*Sp.*784. Bishops ceased to be *Papists*; for they preached against the *Popes* Supremacy to please the King, yet they ceased not to oppugn the Gospel, causing *Tindals* Translation to be burnt; yea, they agreed to the suppressing of
*Ho.*992 Monasteries, leaving their revenues to the King, to make way for the six bloody Articles, which proceedings with all cruelty of inquisition are set
Sp. 792 down, *Holing. P.*946. till they were repealed the second of *Edw.* the sixth.
Sp.ed stopping in the mean while the cause of Reformation well begun by the
Stat.H. Lord *Cromwell*. And this mischief was wrought by *Stephen Gardner*, Bi-
8. *Anno* shop of *Wincheſter*. The six *Articles* are set down in *Speed*, p. 792.
35.c. 5. The *Archbishop* of St. *Andrewes*, his hindring of *Englands*, and *Scotlands*
Edw. 6. Union, for fear of Reformation, *Speed* 794.

As for the daies of King *Edw.* the 6th. we cannot but acknowledge to

the

the glory of the rich mercy of God, that there was a great Reformation of *Religion* made even to admiration, And yet notwithstanding we do much dislike the humor of those, that cry up those daies as a compleat pattern of Reformation, and that indeavour to reduce our *Religion* to the first times of K. *Edw.* which we conceive were comparatively very imperfect, there being four impediments which did much hinder that blessed work. 1.

The 3. Rebellions. One in *Hen.* 8ths time, by the *Priests* of *Lincoln* and *York-shire*, for that Reformation which *Cromwel* had made. The other two in K. *Edwards* daies, one in *Cornwale*, the other in *York-shire*.

The strife that arose suddainly amongst the *Peers*, emulating one anothers honour, *Speed pag.* 837. 2.

The violent oppoſition of the *Popish Bishops*, which made *Martin Bucer* write to K. *Edw.* in his book *de Regi Christi, lib.* 2. *cap.* 1. and say; 3.
Your *Majesty* doth see, that this restoring again the Kingdome of Christ, which we require, yea, which the salvation of us all requireth, may in no wise be expected to come from the Bishops, seeing there be so few among them which do understand the power and proper Offices of this Kingdom; and very many of them by all means (which possibly they can and dare) either oppose themselves against it, or defer and hinder.

The deficiency of zeal and courage even in those *Bishops* who afterwards 4.
proved Martyrs, witnesse the sharpe contention of *Ridly* against *Hooper* for the ceremonies. And the importunate suit of *Cranmer and Ridly* for toleration for the *Masse* for the Kings sister, which was rejected by the *Kings* not only reasons, but tears; whereby the young *King* shewed more zeal then his best Bishops, 139.

The inhumane butcheries, blood-sheddings and cruelties of *Gardiner*, *Bonner*, and the rest of the Bishops in Qu. *Maries* dayes, are so fresh in every mans memory, as that we conceive it a thing altogether unnecessary to make mention of them. Only we fear least the guilt of the blood then shed, should yet remain to be required at the hands of this Nation, because it hath not publickly indeavoured to appease the wrath of God by a general and solemn humiliation for it.

What the practices of the Prelates have been ever since, from the beginning of Qu. *Elizab.* to this present day, would fill a volume (like *Ezekiels* Roll) with lamentation, mourning, and wo to record. For it hath been their great design to hinder all further Reformation, to bring in doctrines of popery, *Arminianism*, and *Libertinism*, to maintain, propagate and much increase the burthen of humane ceremonies: to keep out, and beat down the Preaching of the Word, to silence the faithfull preachers of it, to oppose and persecute the most zealous professors and to turn all Religion into a pompous out-side; and to tread down the power of godlinesse. Insomuch as it is come to an ordinary Proverb, that when any thing is spoiled, We use to say, *The Bishops foot hath been in it.* And in this (and much more which might be said) fulfilling *Bishop Bonners* Prophesie, who when he saw that in King *Edwards* reformation, there was a reservation of Ceremonies and Hierarchy, is credibly reported to have used these words: *Since they have begun to taste of our Broath, it will not be long ere they will eat of our Beef.*

FINIS.